BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE J DOCUMENT IN THE HEXATEUCH

by

Beatrice Laura Goff

(B.A., Wellesley College, 1926; M.A., Wellesley College, 1928)

submitted in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1933

49573

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Gen. -- Genesis.

Ex. -- Exodus.

Lev. -- Leviticus.

Nu. -- Numbers.

Deut. or Dt. -- Deuteronomy.

Jos. -- Joshua.

Ju. -- Judges.

I and II Sam. -- I and II Samuel.

I and II Kgs. -- I and II Kings.

II Chr. -- II Chronicles.

Ps. -- Psalms.

Is. -- Isaiah.

Jer. -- Jeremiah.

Ez. -- Ezekiel.

Dn. -- Daniel.

Mal. -- Malachi.

CC -- Covenant Code.

LXX -- Septuagint.

Encycl. Bibl. -- Encyclopaedia Biblica.

JBL -- Journal of Biblical Literature.

OLZ -- Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.

ZAW -- Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

In the Tabular List of J Material parentheses ( ) are found around verses where it seems desirable to indicate that uncertainty concerning the analysis exists.

An asterisk * is placed beside some verses to indicate that only a portion of the verse in question is to be considered.

In the section devoted to the Text of J a # is prefixed to passages where the difficulties in ascertaining the existence or extent of J are particularly great, and where it is desired to refer the reader to the Tabular List of J Material and the Justification of the Selection of J Material for an appreciation of the uncertainty of the text presented.

INTRODUCTION

Inasmuch as the Hexateuch has been one of the most fruitful sections of the Old Testament for research in the development of the religion of the Israelitish people, great attention has been paid during the last one hundred and seventy-five years to the analysis of these biblical books. The results of the study have been presented in brief form in all Old Testament introductions. Cornill, An Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament and Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament are among the most serviceable of those which have been printed in English. The conclusions of the majority of Pentateuchal scholars have been discussed also in more detailed works which discuss the Hexateuch alone, as, for example, Brightman's The Sources of the Hexateuch, Carpenter and Battersby's The Hexateuch, Carpenter and Harford's The Composition of the Hexateuch, and Holzinger's Einleitung in den Hexateuch. The last book in particular gives a careful and thorough-going survey of the considerations which have led biblical students to analyze the Hexateuch into the J, E, D, and P documents, followed by a detailed study of these four sources. Holzinger has likewise given some very useful tables, which facilitate the task of observing variations in critical opinion concerning the content of the documents. Various

INTRODUCTION

Interest in the Hexateuch has been one of the most fruitful sections of the Old Testament for research in the development of the religion of the Israelitish people. Great attention has been paid during the last one hundred and seventy-five years to the analysis of these biblical books. The results of the study have been presented in brief form in all Old Testament introductions. Driver, in Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament and Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament are among the most serviceable of those which have been printed in English. The conclusions of the majority of Pentateuchal scholars have been discussed also in more detailed works which discuss the Hexateuch alone, as, for example, Bright-Wood's The Sources of the Hexateuch, Carpenter and Battersby's The Hexateuch, Carpenter and Harford's The Composition of the Hexateuch, and Malkinger's Religions in Ben Hexateuch. The last book in particular gives a careful and thorough-going survey of the considerations which have led biblical students to analyze the Hexateuch into the J, E, D, and P documents, followed by a detailed study of these four sources. Malkinger has likewise given some very useful tables, which facilitate the task of observing variations in critical opinion concerning the content of the documents. Various

problems arising in connection with these documents have been treated in publications, some brief, and some of greater extent. Meyer's Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme, in which are included contributions by Luther on Die Persönlichkeit des Jahwisten and other related subjects, Budde's Die biblische Urgeschichte, Eissfeldt's Hexateuch-Synopse, and Pfeiffer's A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis are among the publications of most importance to the study of the Yahwistic source. Beyond this the commentaries have considered in detail the problems arising from an analysis of the text, and Gunkel in particular has made contributions to Pentateuchal criticism in his commentary on Genesis in the series edited by Nowack. Books which would present to the reader a comprehensive view of the separate documents in their original setting, and not complicated by the close proximity of other sources except in points where a consideration of these other sources is unavoidable, would be a most helpful aid to biblical critics, but only Procksch, in a study of the E document (Die Elohimquelle), has attempted the task. Various problems arising in connection with the J, D, and P documents have been discussed, but no attempt has been made to gather these studies together for a balanced picture of the original sources. For this reason, therefore, an extensive consideration of J is a desirable addition to the books on Pentateuchal criticism.

problems relating in connection with these documents have been treated in publications, some brief, and some of greater extent. Meyer's *Die Tarentelle und ihre Verwandten*, in which are included contributions by Leiner on *Die Verwandtschaft des Tarantismus* and other related subjects, Bodde's *Die Giftspinne Tarantula*, Eisenlohr's *Hexentanzorgien*, and Pfeiffer's *Tarantelle* [illegible] *of Dancing* are among the publications of most importance to the study of the Tarantella source. Beyond this the commentaries have considered in detail the problems arising from an analysis of the text. and Fuchsel in particular has made contributions to Pentatonical criticism in his commentary on Dancing in the series edited by Aswell. Books which would provide to the reader a comprehensive view of the separate documents in their original setting, and not complicated by the close proximity of other sources except in points where a consideration of these other sources is unavoidable, would be a most helpful aid to critical critics, but only research, in a study of the document (*Die Tarantelle*), has attempted the task. Various problems arising in connection with the A, B, and P documents have been discussed, but no attempt has been made to gather these studies together for a unified study of the original sources. For this reason, therefore, an extensive consideration of it is a desire in addition to the books on Pentatonical criticism.

Furthermore, the study of J has reached a point where a summary of the difficulties arising within the document, with an evaluation of the solutions which have been advocated by critics, will probably contribute to the simplification of the problems and to progress toward new lines of investigation.

Pentateuchal criticism proper began in the eighteenth century with the work of the French physician Jean Astruc. In 1753 he published a work entitled Conjextures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse. Thus he started what is commonly known as the Earlier Documentary Hypothesis. He noted that in Genesis the two divine names יהוה and אלהים are employed consistently in different strands of the material, and as a result of this observation he concluded that there are two major strands of the Book of Genesis from a combination of which our present book is formed. A number of subordinate strands it seemed possible to distinguish also; and his final decision was that twelve documents in all had been employed in the composition of the book. These documents had been arranged by Moses in the form of four parallel columns, but the confusion of our present text was the result of the attempt of later scribes to unite these columns. Astruc in this work limited himself to observations based on Genesis alone. If he had carried his study to later books

Furthermore, the study of J has revealed a point where a summary of the difficulties arising within the document, with an evaluation of the solutions which have been advocated by critics, will probably contribute to the simplification of the problems and to prescribe therefore new lines of investigation.

Postscriptural criticism proper began in the eighteenth century with the work of the French physician Jean Astruc. In 1753 he published a work entitled Conjectures sur les mémoires originaux dont il paroît que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse. Thus he started what is commonly known as the Higher Documentary Hypothesis. He noted that in Genesis the two divine names יהוה and אלהים are employed consistently in different strands of the material, and as a result of this observation he concluded that there are two major strands of the book of Genesis from a combination of which the present book is formed. A number of subordinate strands it seemed possible to distinguish also; and his final decision was that twelve documents in all had been employed in the composition of the book. These documents had been arranged by Moses in the form of four parallel columns, but the compilation of our present text was the result of the attempt of later editors to unite these columns. Astruc in this work limited himself to observations made on Genesis alone. If he had carried his study to later books

of the Old Testament his results would have had more value. The successor of Astruc was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, who in 1780-83 published his Einleitung in das A.T. It is doubtful whether he knew Astruc's earlier work, but in any case he came to the similar conclusion that two fundamental sources were employed, within which four or five sections of different origin had been inserted. In how far Moses was responsible for the arrangement of these sections Eichhorn was uncertain. At first he was inclined to attribute the compilation to him. Later, however, he said, "Der Name des Zusammenordners kann uns gleichgiltig sein;"[1] and finally he renounced the idea entirely. K. D. Ilgen (1798) made an extremely important advance in the line in which Astruc and Eichhorn had been working when he discovered that the Elohim document, which had seemed to be one of the two fundamental sources, in reality was composed of two separate documents, a first and second Elohist, now termed respectively P and E. This advance, however, for the moment received little consideration. It remained for later scholars to return to Ilgen's important contribution.

The second stage of Pentateuchal criticism is generally called the Fragmentary Hypothesis. Alexander Geddes, an English Roman Catholic theologian, is responsible for

1. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 42.

of the Old Testament his results would have had more value.

The successor of Astruc was Johann Gottfried Eichhorn, who in 1780-83 published his Einleitung in das A.T. It is doubtful whether he knew Astruc's earlier work, but in any case he came to the similar conclusion that two fundamental sources were employed, within which four or five sections of different origin had been inserted. In how far Moses was responsible for the arrangement of these sections Eichhorn was uncertain. At first he was inclined to attribute the compilation to him. Later, however, he said, "Der Ruhm des Zusammenordners kann nur gleichmütig meinen und finally he renounced the idea entirely. C. D. Ilgen (1798) made an extremely important advance in the time in which Astruc and Eichhorn had been working when he discovered that the Sibylla document, which had seemed to be one of the two fundamental sources, in reality was composed of two separate documents, a first and second Sibylla, now termed respectively P and E. This advance, however, for the moment received little consideration. It remained for later scholars to return to Ilgen's important contribution.

The second stage of Pentateuchal criticism is generally called the Fragment Hypothesis. Alexander Geddes, an English Roman Catholic theologian, is responsible for

1. Holzinger, Einleitung, p. 42.

the beginning of this phase of criticism. In 1792 and 1800 he published a work in which he analyzed the whole Pentateuch into a great number of larger and smaller fragments, all of which originated from two chief schools of thought. The result of the influence of these schools was the variation in the use of the names for God. This theory was developed by J. S. Vater still more fully. In his commentary on the Pentateuch (1802-1805) Vater proposed that our Pentateuchal books are the result of a collection of fragments of different periods, assembled, to secure their preservation, at the time of the exile. De Wette likewise was influenced by the Fragmentary Hypothesis as well as inclining in his writings toward the theory of complements. In 1806 and 1807 he published his Beiträge zur Einleitung in das alte Testament. Herein he stated that the books of the Pentateuch are formed from a collection of fragments now arranged in an unnatural order. The division into sources as Astruc and Eichhorn had analyzed them is unconvincing since changes in the names for God could easily have crept in during the years of transmission. The difference in divine names, therefore, corresponds not to the work of individual authors but to the work of different periods or of different schools of religious thought. Genesis and Exodus form the earliest work, a national epic. Leviticus is a later collection of laws. Numbers is a supplement to the first three books. And Deuteronomy, finally, is a late compilation

of laws made in the seventh century. This last contribution has been of great importance for succeeding criticism.

By Ewald in 1823 the Fragmentary Hypothesis was pushed aside and in its place was substituted the Supplementary Hypothesis. To this change Ewald was led by the observation that a fundamental unity and governing plan exists throughout the Pentateuch. Ewald was followed by P. von Bohlen (1835), J. J. Stählein (1835), F. Bleek (1836), and F. Tuch (1858). In general the Supplementary Hypothesis supposes that a fundamental work was employed by a series of later writers each of whom successively added his own contribution to the material which he received. Astruc's Elohist was accepted as the fundamental work, generally called the Grundschrift.

While the latter theory was meeting with widespread favor some attempts were made to combine the valuable elements in the Supplementary Hypothesis with the Early Documentary Theory of Astruc and Eichhorn. C. P. W. Gramberg (1828), J. J. Stählein (1830), and Ewald in his Geschichte des Volkes Israel (1843) were among those who labored in this direction. The real founder of the Later Documentary Hypothesis, however, was H. Hupfeld (1853), who decided that at the basis of the Pentateuch there were three independent documents, a fundamental writing, a younger Elohist, and the Yahwist. These three had been amalgamated

of laws made in the seventh century. This last contribution has been of great importance for succeeding critics.

By Smaid in 1887 the *Documentary Hypothesis* was pushed aside and in its place was substituted the *Supplementary Hypothesis*. To this change Smaid was led by the observation that a fundamental unity and governing plan exists throughout the Pentateuch. Smaid was followed by T. von Dahlen (1890), J. J. Stählein (1893), F. Giesebrecht (1895), and F. Tuch (1835). In general the *Supplementary Hypothesis* supposes that a fundamental work was employed by a series of later writers each of whom successively added his own contribution to the material which he received. Ascuc's Elohist was accepted as the fundamental work, generally called the *Grundschrift*.

While the latter theory was meeting with widespread favor such attempts were made to combine the valuable elements in the *Supplementary Hypothesis* with the *Early Documentary Theory* of Astruc and Eichhorn. C. P. W. Germer (1816), J. J. Stählein (1830), and Smaid in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1843) were among those who labored in this direction. The real founder of the *Later Documentary Hypothesis*, however, was E. Reuss (1853), who decided that at the basis of the Pentateuch there were three independent documents, a fundamental writing, a younger Elohist, and the Yahwist. These three had been amalgamated

by a subsequent redactor. In thus dividing the Elohist into two separate sources he returned to the discovery made years before by Ilgen, but only now appreciated by subsequent critics. E. Böhmer (1860), Hupfeld's pupil, developed his work still further. A. Knobel (1852-1861) modified their conclusions somewhat by the supposition that the Grundschrift was supplemented by two later writers, the Yahwist, who combined two separate sources, and the Deuteronomist. The date of the sources next became the subject in the center of attention, with results of far-reaching importance. Reuss in a series of lectures in 1834 had expressed his doubts whether the Grundschrift was the earliest of the sources. Vatke and George (1835) supported him without developing this theory to any great extent. The work of fundamental importance, however, was done by Reuss's pupil Karl Heinrich Graf (1865), who fixed the date of the Grundschrift, now called P, at the very end of the Pentateuchal development, in the time of Ezra. From Graf the whole following movement has taken its name. Some sections of P were left in doubt by Graf. These latter were considered by Bishop Colenso (1862-1879), who proved satisfactorily that by far the greater part of P is unhistorical, and so could as a whole be dated in a very late period. Nöldeke, although refusing to accept Graf's date for P, in his Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A.T. (1869)

by a subsequent redactor. In this dividing the Jahvist into two separate sources is returned to the discovery made years before by Ilgen, but only now appreciated by subsequent critics. E. Böhmer (1859), Nöldeke's pupil, developed his work still further. A. Kuenen (1828-1891) modified their conclusions somewhat by the supposition that the Deuteronomist was supplemented by two later writers, the Yahvist, who combined two separate sources, and the Deuteronomist. The date of the sources then became the subject in the center of attention, with results of far-reaching importance. Ewald in a series of lectures in 1834 had expressed his doubts whether the Grundschrift was the earliest of the sources. Vatke and Graf (1853) supported him without developing this theory to any great extent. The work of Graf became important. However, was done by Ewald's pupil Karl Heinrich Graf (1855), who fixed the date of the Grundschrift, now called P, at the very end of the Pentateuchal development, in the time of Ezra. From Graf the whole following movement has taken its name. Some sections of P were left in doubt by Graf. These latter were considered by Eduard Reuss (1852-1879). who proved satisfactorily that by far the greater part of P is unhistorical, and so could as a whole be dated in a very late period. Wellhausen, although returning to Ewald's date for P, in his Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A.T. (1866)

was the first adequately to determine the contents of P. Graf's most important successor, however, was Julius Wellhausen, who as head of the holländisch-deutsche Schule, together with A. Kuenen and A. Dillmann carried on the investigations as Graf pointed out the way. The most important works of these men are as follows: Die Composition des Pentateuchs (1876) by Wellhausen; Onderzoek (1861) by Kuenen; and the rewriting of Knobel's commentary by Dillmann (1875). The third of these men-- Dillmann-- held the opinion that E was older than J and was used by J. Wellhausen took issue with him on this subject and has been followed by biblical scholarship.

While the Graf-Wellhausen School was developing the Later Documentary Hypothesis, radical opposition to their work arose among a group of biblical critics. Distressed by the doubts which such theories cast on the historical reliability of the Pentateuchal narratives, they attempted to refute the supporting arguments. They questioned in particular the legitimacy of employing the variation in divine names as criterion for a determination of sources since the soundness of the text was open to question at many points. As support for their view great emphasis was laid on the variations between the Massoretic text and the Septuagint. Foremost among the representatives of this line of thought were A. Klostermann (1893), James Orr (1906), B. D. Eerdmans (1908), H. M. Wiener (1909, 1912),

was the first adequately to determine the contents of E. Graf's most important successor. However, was Julius Wellhausen, who as head of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, together with A. Kuenen and S. Dillmann carried on the investigations as Graf pointed out the way. The most important works of these men are as follows: *Die Composition des Pentateuchs* (1876) by Wellhausen; *Geschichte* (1881) by Kuenen; and the revisiting of Knobel's commentary by Dillmann (1879). The twins of these men--Dillmann-- is of the opinion that E was older than J and was used by J. Wellhausen took issue with him on this subject and has been followed by liberal scholarship.

While the Graf-Wellhausen School was developing the *Later Pentateuch Hypothesis*, radical opposition to their work arose among a group of biblical critics. Interested by the doubts which such theories cast on the historical reliability of the Pentateuchal narratives, they attempted to refute the supporting arguments. They questioned in particular the legitimacy of employing the variation in divine names as criterion for a determination of sources since the sameness of the text was open to question at many points. An support for their view great emphasis was laid on the variations between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. Foremost among the representatives of this line of thought were A. Klostermann (1893), James Orr (1906), R. D. Berkeme (1908), A. E. Turner (1909, 1912),

and J. Dahse (1912, 1913).

A new method of approach to the biblical material was likewise developed by a group of German scholars the most notable of whom are H. Gunkel, H. Gressmann, and E. Sellin. The method was named Stoff-Kritik in distinction from the Literar-Kritik of the Graf-Wellhausen School. The interest of these critics is in the history of the development of different types of literature. They deplore the emphasis of the literary school on a study of the personalities of the various authors since they believe it rests on a false comprehension of the literary activity of the early time, which was as closely governed by custom as were the other activities of daily life.

When criticism turned to a minute examination of the J document a question concerning its unity arose. The first to raise this question was E. Schrader in Studien zur Kritik und Erklärung der biblischen Urgeschichte (1863). He was followed by Reuss and by Kuenen. A work of far-reaching importance in this matter was done by K. Budde (1883) when he separated in the earliest stratum[1] of the Urgeschichte two strands, J^1 and J^2. Accepting the chief conclusions of Budde regarding the Yahwistic Urgeschichte

1. His work is considered in detail in Part II, Chapter III. The reader is advised to consult that chapter for a fuller discussion of the work of Budde, Gunkel, Eissfeldt, and Pfeiffer.

and C. Dance (1912, 1913).

A new method of approach to the biblical material was likewise developed by a group of German scholars the most notable of whom are H. Gunkel, H. Gressmann, and L. Baltin. The method was named Gattungsforschung in distinction from the Literarkritik of the Graf-Wellhausen School. The interest of these critics is in the history of the development of different types of literature. They explore the antecedents of the literary school on a study of the peculiarities of the various authors since they believe it rests on a false comprehension of the literary activity of the early time, which was as closely governed by custom as were the other activities of daily life.

When critics turned to a minute examination of the J document a question concerning its unity arose. The first to raise this question was E. Corrader in Studien zur Kritik und Erklärung der biblischen Urgeschichte (1853). He was followed by Ewald and by Kuenen. A work of far-reaching importance in this matter was done by R. Budde (1883) when he separated in the earliest strata of the Urquellschrift two strands, J^1 and J^2. Accepting the chief conclusions of Budde regarding the Yahwistic Urquellschrift

1. His work is considered in detail in Part II, Chapter III. The reader is advised to consult that chapter for a fuller discussion of the work of Budde, Cornill, Kittel, and Pfeiffer.

Gunkel carried his study into other portions of Genesis and came to the conclusion that J is not the composition of a central personality, but the compilation of a school of writers. In 1922 this solution of the critical problems within J, which had been widely accepted, was challenged by O. Eissfeldt in an attempt at a fresh analysis of the Hexateuch. The compound narratives which heretofore had been explained as the result of the labors of a school of writers seemed to him to find more adequate explanation as the work of two individual authors. His theory proposed, then, that four narrators (without including D) were responsible for the composition of the Hexateuch-- the earliest L (the Lay source), the second J (the Yahwist), the third E (the Elohist), and the fourth P (the Priestly Source). In a similar attempt to recognize the literary unity of the Yahwistic source while he faced the problems so keenly appreciated by Budde and Gunkel, R. H. Pfeiffer (1930) separated from the J document material which he attributed to a fourth source, S. In its sources, literary structure and style, mood, and religion he noted that the Urgeschichte and certain difficult chapters farther on in Genesis resemble one another while they contrast with J. These contrasts are so striking that they cannot have originated from the same hand. Such difficult chapters, he maintained, probably form part of an early Edomitic writing which was added to

Dunkel carried his study into other portions of Genesis and came to the conclusion that J is not the composition of a central personality, but the compilation of a school of writers. In 1922 this solution of the critical problems within J, which was been widely accepted, was challenged by O. Eissfeldt in an attempt at a fresh analysis of the Hexateuch. The component narrative which Eissfeldt had been maintained as the result of the labors of a school of writers needed to him to find more adequate explanation as the work of two individual authors. His theory proposed, then, that four narrators (without including D) were responsible for the composition of the Hexateuch-- the earliest L (the Lay source), the second J (the Yahwist), the third E (the Elohist), and the fourth P (the Priestly Source). In a similar attempt to reconcile the literary unity of the Pentateuch Aurrey Hills be faced the problem to deeply appreciated by Budde and Gunkel. H. S. Pfeiffer (1928) separated from the J document material which he attributed to a Jonian source, S. In its structure, literary character and style, Moses, and religion he noted that the Urpentateuchs and certain artificial chapters larger on in Genesis resemble one another while they contrast with J. These contrasts are so striking that they cannot have originated from the same hand. Such artificial chapters, he maintained, probably form part of an early Semitic writing which was added to

the Pentateuch at a very late date.

In these recent investigations of the problems within J the same questions are often raised and discussed from a variety of points of view. It is time, then, that a classification of these views be made, in the hope that, when the points of agreement are noticed, and the supporting facts and weaknesses of each theory are appraised, the fruitful lines for future effort may seem clearer to Pentateuchal critics. An important part of the present work is devoted to this task. It is hoped likewise that a suggestive step has been taken toward an actual solution of some of the problems.

the Renaissance at a very late date.

In these newly interpretations of the problems within the same questions are often raised and discussed from a variety of points of view. It is hope, then, that a classification of these views be made, in the hope that when the points of agreement are noticed, and the contrasting lines and weaknesses of each theory are appraised, the trained lines for future effort may then direct to fruitful critics. An important part of the present work is devoted to this task. It is hoped likewise that a suggestive step has been taken towards an actual solution of some of the problems.

PART I

CONTENTS OF J

THE TEXT OF J
(according to the Authorized Version of the Old Testament)

In the following section the continuous text of the J document is presented according to the Authorized Version of the Old Testament. It will be recognized that there are numerous gaps therein. In some of these cases the J material is probably still in existence, but so thoroughly worked over and so imbedded in later strata that it is no longer possible to identify it with any degree of assurance. Because of the high degree of uncertainty involved in any attempt to isolate J from the surrounding material at these points, the present writer has deemed it advisable to leave the gaps frankly where these great difficulties exist. For an attempt to achieve a finer analysis, as well as for a discussion of the analysis which has been made the reader is referred to the <u>Justification of the Selection of J Material</u> in a later section of Part I.

Genesis XII

NOW the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee:
2 And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing:
3 And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.
4 So Abram departed, as the LORD had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him:

6 ¶ And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the plain of Moreh. ~~And the Canaanite was then in the land~~.
7 And the LORD appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land: and there builded he an altar unto the LORD, who appeared unto him.
8 And he removed from thence unto a mountain on the east of Beth-el, and pitched his tent, *having* Beth-el on the west, and Hai on the east: and there he builded an altar unto the LORD, and called upon the name of the LORD.
9 And Abram journeyed, going on still toward the south.

10 ¶ And there was a famine in the land: and Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there; for the famine *was* grievous in the land.
11 And it came to pass, when he was come near to enter into Egypt, that he said unto Sarai his wife, Behold now, I know that thou *art* a fair woman to look upon:
12 Therefore it shall come to pass, when the Egyptians shall see thee, that they shall say, This *is* his wife: and they will kill me, but they will save thee alive.
13 Say, I pray thee, thou *art* my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee.
14 ¶ And it came to pass, that, when Abram was come into Egypt, the Egyptians beheld the woman that she *was* very fair.
15 The princes also of Pharaoh saw her, and commended her before Pharaoh: and the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house.
16 And he entreated Abram well for her sake: and he had sheep, and oxen, and he asses, and menservants, and maidservants, and she asses, and camels.
17 And the LORD plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues, because of Sarai, Abram's wife.
18 And Pharaoh called Abram, and said, What *is* this *that* thou hast done unto me? why didst thou not tell me that she *was* thy wife?
19 Why saidst thou, She *is* my sister? so I might have taken her to me to wife: now therefore behold thy wife, take *her*, and go thy way.

20 And Pharaoh commanded *his* men concerning him: and they sent him away, and his wife, and all that he had.

Genesis XIII

AND Abram went up out of Egypt, he, and his wife, and all that he had, and Lot with him, into the south.
2 And Abram *was* very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold.

5 ¶ And Lot also, which went with Abram, had flocks, and herds, and tents.

7 And there was a strife between the herdmen of Abram's cattle and the herdmen of Lot's cattle: ~~and the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the land~~.
8 And Abram said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen; for we *be* brethren.
9 *Is* not the whole land before thee? separate thyself, I pray thee, from me: if *thou wilt take* the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if *thou depart* to the right hand, then I will go to the left.

10 And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, ~~that it *was* well watered every where, before the LORD destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, *even* as the garden of the LORD, like the land of Egypt~~, as thou comest unto Zoar.
11 Then Lot chose him all the plain of Jordan; and Lot journeyed east: ~~and they separated themselves the one from the other~~.
12 ~~Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the plain~~, and pitched *his* tent toward Sodom.
13 But the men of Sodom *were* wicked and sinners before the LORD exceedingly.
14 ¶ And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward:
15 For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever.
16 And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a man can number the dust of the earth, *then* shall thy seed also be numbered.
17 Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee.
18 Then Abram removed *his* tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which *is* in Hebron, and built there an altar unto the LORD.

Genesis XVI

NOW Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children: and she had a handmaid, an Egyptian, whose name *was* Hagar.
2 And Sarai said unto Abram, Behold now, the LORD hath restrained me from bearing: I pray thee, go in unto my maid; it may be that I may obtain children by her. And Abram hearkened to the voice of Sarai.

4 ¶ And he went in unto Hagar, and she conceived: and when she saw that she had conceived, her mistress was despised in her eyes.
5 And Sarai said unto Abram, My wrong *be* upon thee: I have given my maid into thy bosom; and when she saw that she had conceived, I was despised in her eyes: the LORD judge between me and thee.
6 But Abram said unto Sarai, Behold, thy

maid *is* in thy hand; do to her as it pleaseth thee. And when Sarai dealt hardly with her, she fled from her face.
7 ¶ And the angel of the LORD found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, ~~by the fountain in the way to Shur~~.
8 And he said, Hagar, Sarai's maid, whence camest thou? and whither wilt thou go? And she said, I flee from the face of my mistress Sarai.

11 And the angel of the LORD said unto her, Behold, thou *art* with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael; because the LORD hath heard thy affliction.
12 And he will be a wild man; his hand *will be* against every man, and every man's hand against him: and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren.
13 And she called the name of the LORD that spake unto her, Thou God seest me: for she said, Have I also here looked after him that seeth me?
14 Wherefore the well was called Beer-lahai-roi: behold, *it is* between Kadesh and Bered.

Genesis XVIII

AND the LORD appeared unto him in the
plains of Mamre: and he sat in the tent
door in the heat of the day;
2 And he lifted up his eyes and looked, and,
lo, three men stood by him: and when he saw
them, he ran to meet them from the tent
door, and bowed himself toward the ground,
3 And said, My Lord, if now I have found

favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray
thee, from thy servant:
4 Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched,
and wash your feet, and rest yourselves un-
der the tree:
5 And I will fetch a morsel of bread, and
comfort ye your hearts; after that ye shall
pass on: for therefore are ye come to your
servant. And they said, So do, as thou hast
said.
6 And Abraham hastened into the tent unto
Sarah, and said, Make ready quickly three
measures of fine meal, knead *it*, and make
cakes upon the hearth.
7 And Abraham ran unto the herd, and
fetched a calf tender and good, and gave *it*
unto a young man; and he hasted to dress it.
8 And he took butter, and milk, and the calf
which he had dressed, and set *it* before them;
and he stood by them under the tree, and they
did eat.
9 ¶ And they said unto him, Where *is* Sarah
thy wife? And he said, Behold, in the
tent.
10 And he said, I will certainly return unto
thee according to the time of life; and, lo,
Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah
heard *it* in the tent door, which *was* behind
him.
11 Now Abraham and Sarah *were* old *and*
well stricken in age; *and* it ceased to be with
Sarah after the manner of women.
12 Therefore Sarah laughed within herself,
saying, After I am waxed old shall I have
pleasure, my lord being old also?
13 And the LORD said unto Abraham, Where

fore did Sarah laugh, saying, Shall I of a
surety bear a child, which am old?
14 Is any thing too hard for the LORD? At
the time appointed I will return unto thee,
according to the time of life, and Sarah shall
have a son.
15 Then Sarah denied, saying, I laughed
not; for she was afraid. And he said, Nay;
but thou didst laugh.
16 ¶ And the men rose up from thence, and
looked toward Sodom: and Abraham went
with them to bring them on the way.

\# 20 And the LORD said, Because the cry of
Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because
their sin is very grievous,
21 I will go down now, and see whether
they have done altogether according to the
cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not,
I will know.
22 And the men turned their faces from
thence, and went toward Sodom:

and

Abraham returned unto his place.

Genesis XIX

AND there came two angels to Sodom at
even; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom:
and Lot seeing *them* rose up to meet them;
and he bowed himself with his face toward
the ground;
2 And he said, Behold now, my lords, turn
in, I pray you, into your servant's house,
and tarry all night, and wash your feet, and
ye shall rise up early, and go on your ways.
And they said, Nay; but we will abide in the
street all night.
3 And he pressed upon them greatly; and
they turned in unto him, and entered into
his house; and he made them a feast, and did
bake unleavened bread, and they did eat.
4 ¶ But before they lay down, the men of
the city, *even* the men of Sodom, compassed
the house round, both old and young, all the
people from every quarter:
5 And they called unto Lot, and said unto
him, Where *are* the men which came in to
thee this night? bring them out unto us, that
we may know them.
6 And Lot went out at the door unto them,
and shut the door after him,
7 And said, I pray you, brethren, do not so
wickedly.
8 Behold now, I have two daughters which
have not known man; let me, I pray you,
bring them out unto you, and do ye to them
as *is* good in your eyes: only unto these
men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof.
9 And they said, Stand back. And they said
again, This one *fellow* came in to sojourn,
and he will needs be a judge: now will we
deal worse with thee than with them. And
they pressed sore upon the man, *even* Lot,
and came near to break the door.
10 But the men put forth their hand, and
pulled Lot into the house to them, and shut
to the door.
11 And they smote the men that *were* at the
door of the house with blindness, both small
and great: so that they wearied themselves
to find the door.
12 ¶ And the men said unto Lot, Hast thou
here any besides? son in law, and thy sons,
and thy daughters, and whatsoever thou hast
in the city, bring *them* out of this place:
13 For we will destroy this place, because
the cry of them is waxen great before the
face of the LORD; and the LORD hath sent
us to destroy it.
14 And Lot went out, and spake unto his
sons in law, which married his daughters, and
said, Up, get you out of this place; for the
LORD will destroy this city. But he seemed
as one that mocked unto his sons in law.
15 ¶ And when the morning arose, then
the angels hastened Lot, saying, Arise, take
thy wife, and thy two daughters, which are
here; lest thou be consumed in the iniquity
of the city.
16 And while he lingered, the men laid hold
upon his hand, and upon the hand of his wife,
and upon the hand of his two daughters; the

LORD being merciful unto him: and they brought him forth, and set him without the city.
17 ¶ And it came to pass, when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, Escape for thy life; look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain; escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed.
18 And Lot said unto them, Oh, not so, my Lord:
19 Behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast shewed unto me in saving my life; and I cannot escape to the mountain, lest some evil take me, and I die:
20 Behold now, this city *is* near to flee unto, and it *is* a little one: O, let me escape thither, (*is* it not a little one?) and my soul shall live.
21 And he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city, for the which thou hast spoken.
22 Haste thee, escape thither; for I cannot do anything till thou be come thither. Therefore the name of the city was called Zoar.
23 ¶ The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar.
24 Then the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;
25 And he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground.
26 ¶ But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt.

27 ¶ And Abraham gat up early in the morning to the place where he stood before the LORD:
28 And he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and, lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace.

Genesis XXI

AND the LORD visited Sarah as he had said,

2 For Sarah conceived, and bare Abraham a son in his old age,

7 And she said, Who would have said unto Abraham, that Sarah should have given children suck? for I have borne *him* a son in his old age.

6b all that hear will laugh with me.

33 ¶ And *Abraham* planted a grove in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of the LORD, the everlasting God.

Genesis XXIV

AND Abraham was old, *and* well stricken in age: and the LORD had blessed Abraham in all things.
2 And Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had, Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh:
3 And I will make thee swear by the LORD, the God of heaven, and the God of the earth, that thou shalt not take a wife unto my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, among whom I dwell:
4 But thou shalt go unto my country, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son Isaac.
5 And the servant said unto him, Peradventure the woman will not be willing to follow me unto this land: must I needs bring thy son again unto the land from whence thou camest?
6 And Abraham said unto him, Beware thou that thou bring not my son thither again.
7 ¶ The LORD God of heaven, which took me from my father's house, and from the land of my kindred, and which spake unto me, and that sware unto me, saying, Unto thy seed will I give this land; he shall send his angel before thee, and thou shalt take a wife unto my son from thence.
8 And if the woman will not be willing to follow thee, then thou shalt be clear from this my oath: only bring not my son thither again.

9 And the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham his master, and sware to him concerning that matter.
10 ¶ And the servant took ten camels of the camels of his master, and departed; for all the goods of his master *were* in his hand: and he arose, and went to Mesopotamia, unto the city of Nahor.
11 And he made his camels to kneel down without the city by a well of water at the time of the evening, *even* the time that women go out to draw *water*.
12 And he said, O LORD God of my master Abraham, I pray thee, send me good speed this day, and shew kindness unto my master Abraham.
13 Behold, I stand *here* by the well of water; and the daughters of the men of the city come out to draw water:
14 And let it come to pass, that the damsel to whom I shall say, Let down thy pitcher, I pray thee, that I may drink; and she shall say, Drink, and I will give thy camels drink also: *let the same be* she *that* thou hast appointed for thy servant Isaac; and thereby shall I know that thou hast shewed kindness unto my master.
15 ¶ And it came to pass, before he had done speaking, that, behold, Rebekah came out, ~~who was born to Bethuel, son of Milcah, the wife of Nahor, Abraham's brother~~, with her pitcher upon her shoulder.
16 And the damsel *was* very fair to look upon, a virgin, neither had any man known her: and she went down to the well, and filled her pitcher, and came up.

17 And the servant ran to meet her, and said, Let me, I pray thee, drink a little water of thy pitcher.
18 And she said, Drink, my lord: and she hasted, and let down her pitcher upon her hand, and gave him drink.
19 And when she had done giving him drink, she said, I will draw *water* for thy camels also, until they have done drinking.
20 And she hasted, and emptied her pitcher into the trough, and ran again unto the well to draw *water*, and drew for all his camels.
21 And the man wondering at her held his peace, to wit whether the LORD had made his journey prosperous or not.
22 And it came to pass, as the camels had done drinking, that the man took a golden earring of half a shekel weight, and two bracelets for her hands of ten *shekels* weight of gold;
23 And said, Whose daughter *art* thou? tell me, I pray thee: is there room *in* thy father's house for us to lodge in?
24 And she said unto him, I *am* the daughter of Bethuel the son of Milcah, which she bare unto Nahor.
25 She said moreover unto him, We have both straw and provender enough, and room to lodge in.
26 And the man bowed down his head, and worshipped the LORD.
27 And he said, Blessed *be* the LORD God of my master Abraham, who hath not left destitute my master of his mercy and his truth: I *being* in the way, the LORD led me to the house of my master's brethren.

28 And the damsel ran, and told *them of* her mother's house these things.
29 ¶ And Rebekah had a brother, and his name *was* Laban: and Laban ran out unto the man, unto the well.
30 And it came to pass, when he saw the earring, and bracelets upon his sister's hands, and when he heard the words of Rebekah his sister, saying, Thus spake the man unto me, that he came unto the man; and, behold, he stood by the camels at the well.
31 And he said, Come in, thou blessed of the LORD; wherefore standest thou without? for I have prepared the house, and room for the camels.
32 ¶ And the man came into the house: and he ungirded his camels, and gave straw and provender for the camels, and water to wash his feet, and the men's feet that *were* with him.
33 And there was set *meat* before him to eat: but he said, I will not eat, until I have told mine errand. And he said, Speak on.
34 And he said, I *am* Abraham's servant.
35 And the LORD hath blessed my master greatly, and he is become great: and he hath given him flocks, and herds, and silver, and gold, and menservants, and maidservants, and camels, and asses.
36 And Sarah my master's wife bare a son to my master when she was old: and unto him hath he given all that he hath.
37 And my master made me swear, saying, Thou shalt not take a wife to my son of the daughters of the Canaanites, in whose land I dwell:

38 But thou shalt go unto my father's house, and to my kindred, and take a wife unto my son.
39 And I said unto my master, Peradventure the woman will not follow me.
40 And he said unto me, The LORD, before whom I walk, will send his angel with thee, and prosper thy way; and thou shalt take a wife for my son of my kindred, and of my father's house:
41 Then shalt thou be clear from *this* my oath, when thou comest to my kindred; and if they give not thee *one*, thou shalt be clear from my oath.
42 And I came this day unto the well, and said, O LORD God of my master Abraham, if now thou do prosper my way which I go:
43 Behold, I stand by the well of water; and it shall come to pass, that when the virgin cometh forth to draw *water*, and I say to her, Give me, I pray thee, a little water of thy pitcher to drink;
44 And she say to me, Both drink thou, and I will also draw for thy camels: *let* the same *be* the woman whom the LORD hath appointed out for my master's son.
45 And before I had done speaking in mine heart, behold, Rebekah came forth with her pitcher on her shoulder; and she went down unto the well, and drew *water:* and I said unto her, Let me drink, I pray thee.
46 And she made haste, and let down her pitcher from her *shoulder*, and said, Drink, and I will give thy camels drink also: so I drank, and she made the camels drink also. 65

47 And I asked her, and said, Whose daughter *art* thou? And she said, The daughter of Bethuel, Nahor's son, whom Milcah bare unto him: and I put the earring upon her face, and the bracelets upon her hands.
48 And I bowed down my head, and worshipped the LORD, and blessed the LORD God of my master Abraham, which had led me in the right way to take my master's brother's daughter unto his son.
49 And now, if ye will deal kindly and truly with my master, tell me: and if not, tell me; that I may turn to the right hand, or to the left.
50 Then Laban and Bethuel answered and said, The thing proceedeth from the LORD: we cannot speak unto thee bad or good.
51 Behold, Rebekah *is* before thee; take *her*, and go, and let her be thy master's son's wife, as the LORD hath spoken.
52 And it came to pass, that, when Abraham's servant heard their words, he worshipped the LORD, *bowing himself* to the earth.
53 And the servant brought forth jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment, and gave *them* to Rebekah: he gave also to her brother and to her mother precious things.
54 And they did eat and drink, he and the men that *were* with him, and tarried all night; and they rose up in the morning, and he said, Send me away unto my master.
55 And her brother and her mother said, Let the damsel abide with us *a few* days, at the least ten: after that she shall go.

56 And he said unto them, Hinder me not, seeing the LORD hath prospered my way; send me away that I may go to my master.
57 And they said, We will call the damsel, and inquire at her mouth.
58 And they called Rebekah, and said unto her, Wilt thou go with this man? And she said, I will go.

60 And they blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Thou *art* our sister; be thou *the mother* of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the gate of those which hate them.
61 ¶ And Rebekah arose, and her damsels, and they rode upon the camels, and followed the man: and the servant took Rebekah, and went his way.
62 And Isaac came from the way of the well Lahai-roi; for he dwelt in the south country.
63 And Isaac went out to meditate in the field at the eventide: and he lifted up his eyes, and saw, and, behold, the camels *were* coming.
64 And Rebekah lifted up her eyes, and when she saw Isaac, she lighted off the camel.
65 For she *had* said unto the servant, What man *is* this that walketh in the field to meet us? And the servant *had* said, It *is* my master: therefore she took a vail, and covered herself.
66 And the servant told Isaac all things that he had done.
67 And Isaac brought her into his mother Sarah's tent, and took Rebekah, and she became his wife; and he loved her: and Isaac was comforted after his mother's *death.*

Genesis XXV

and Isaac dwelt by the well Lahai-roi.

21 And Isaac entreated the LORD for his wife, because she *was* barren: and the LORD was entreated of him, and Rebekah his wife conceived.
22 And the children struggled together within her; and she said, If *it be* so, why *am* I thus? And she went to inquire of the LORD.
23 And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger.
24 ¶ And when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, *there were* twins in her womb.
25 And the first came out red, all over ~~like a hairy garment~~; and they called his name Esau.
26 And after that came his brother out, and his hand took hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob:

27 And the boys grew: and Esau was a cunning hunter, a man of the field; and Jacob *was* a plain man, dwelling in tents.
28 And Isaac loved Esau, because he did eat of *his* venison: but Rebekah loved Jacob.
29 ¶ And Jacob sod pottage: and Esau came from the field, and he *was* faint:
30 And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red *pottage;* for I *am* faint: therefore was his name called Edom.
31 And Jacob said, Sell me this day thy birthright.
32 And Esau said, Behold, I *am* at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me?
33 And Jacob said, Swear to me this day; and he sware unto him: and he sold his birthright unto Jacob.
34 Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentiles; and he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way. Thus Esau despised *his* birthright.

Genesis XXVI

AND there was a famine in the land, ~~besides the first famine that was in the days of Abraham.~~ And Isaac went unto Abimelech king of the Philistines unto Gerar.
2 And the LORD appeared unto him, and said, Go not down into Egypt; ~~dwell in the land which I shall tell thee of~~.
3 Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; ~~for unto thee, and unto thy seed, I will give all these countries~~, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father;
4 And I will make thy seed to multiply as the stars of heaven, ~~and will give unto thy seed all these countries~~; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed:

6 ¶ And Isaac dwelt in Gerar.
7 And the men of the place asked *him* of his wife; and he said, She *is* my sister: for he feared to say, *She is* my wife; lest, *said he*, the men of the place should kill me for Rebekah; because she *was* fair to look upon.
8 And it came to pass, when he had been there a long time, that Abimelech king of the Philistines looked out at a window, and saw, and, behold, Isaac *was* sporting with Rebekah his wife.
9 And Abimelech called Isaac, and said, Behold, of a surety she *is* thy wife: and how

saidst thou, She *is* my sister? And Isaac said unto him, Because I said, Lest I die for her.
10 And Abimelech said, What *is* this thou hast done unto us? one of the people might lightly have lain with thy wife, and thou shouldest have brought guiltiness upon us.
11 And Abimelech charged all *his* people, saying, He that toucheth this man or his wife shall surely be put to death.
12 Then Isaac sowed in that land, and received in the same year a hundredfold: and the LORD blessed him.
13 And the man waxed great, and went forward, and grew until he became very great:
14 For he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants: and the Philistines envied him.

16 And Abimelech said unto Isaac, Go from us; for thou art much mightier than we.
17 ¶ And Isaac departed thence, and pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar, and dwelt there.

19 And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water.
20 And the herdmen of Gerar did strive

with Isaac's herdmen, saying, The water *is* ours: and he called the name of the well Esek; because they strove with him.
21 And they digged another well, and strove for that also: and he called the name of it Sitnah.
22 And he removed from thence, and digged another well; and for that they strove not: and he called the name of it Rehoboth; and he said, For now the LORD hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land.
23 And he went up from thence to Beer-sheba.
24 And the LORD appeared unto him the same night, and said, I *am* the God of Abraham thy father: fear not, for I *am* with thee, and will bless thee, and multiply thy seed for my servant Abraham's sake.
25 And he builded an altar there, and called upon the name of the LORD, and pitched his tent there: and there Isaac's servants digged a well.
26 ¶ Then Abimelech went to him from Gerar, and Ahuzzath one of his friends, and Phichol the chief captain of his army.
27 And Isaac said unto them, Wherefore come ye to me, seeing ye hate me, and have sent me away from you?
28 And they said, We saw certainly that the LORD was with thee: and we said, Let there be now an oath betwixt us, *even* betwixt us and thee, and let us make a covenant with thee;
29 That thou wilt do us no hurt, as we have not touched thee, and as we have done unto thee nothing but good, and have sent thee

away in peace: thou *art* now the blessed of the LORD.
30 And he made them a feast, and they did eat and drink.
31 And they rose up betimes in the morning, and sware one to another: and Isaac sent them away, and they departed from him in peace.
32 And it came to pass the same day, that Isaac's servants came, and told him concerning the well which they had digged, and said unto him, We have found water.
33 And he called it Shebah: therefore the name of the city *is* Beer-sheba unto this day.

Genesis XXVII (analysis uncertain)

Genesis XXVIII

10 ¶ And Jacob went out from Beer-sheba, and went toward Haran.

13 And, behold, the LORD stood above it, and said, I *am* the LORD God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed;

14 And thy seed shall be as the dust of the
earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south: and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

15 And, behold, I *am* with thee, and will keep thee in all *places* whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done *that* which I have spoken to thee of.

16 ¶ And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the LORD is in this place; and I knew *it* not.

19 And he called the name of that place Beth-el:

Genesis XXIX

2 And he looked, and behold a well in the field, and, lo, there *were* three flocks of sheep lying by it; for out of that well they watered the flocks: and a great stone *was* upon the well's mouth.

3 And thither were all the flocks gathered: and they rolled the stone from the well's mouth, and watered the sheep, and put the stone again upon the well's mouth in his place.

4 And Jacob said unto them, My brethren, whence *be* ye? And they said, Of Haran *are* we.

5 And he said unto them, Know ye Laban the son of Nahor? And they said, We know *him*.

6 And he said unto them, *Is* he well? And they said, *He is* well: and, behold, Rachel his daughter cometh with the sheep.

7 And he said, Lo, *it is* yet high day, neither *is it* time that the cattle should be gathered together: water ye the sheep, and go *and* feed *them*.

8 And they said, We cannot, until all the flocks be gathered together, and *till* they roll the stone from the well's mouth; then we water the sheep.

9 ¶ And while he yet spake with them, Rachel came with her father's sheep: for she kept them.

10 And it came to pass, when Jacob saw
Rachel the daughter of Laban his mother's
brother, and the sheep of Laban his mother's
brother, that Jacob went near, and rolled the
stone from the well's mouth, and watered
the flock of Laban his mother's brother.
11 And Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted up
his voice, and wept.
12 And Jacob told Rachel that he *was* her

father's brother, and that he *was* Rebekah's
son: and she ran and told her father.
13 And it came to pass, when Laban heard
the tidings of Jacob his sister's son, that he
ran to meet him, and embraced him, and
kissed him, and brought him to his house.
And he told Laban all these things.
14 And Laban said to him, Surely thou *art*
my bone and my flesh. And he abode with
him the space of a month.

26 And Laban said, It must not be so done
in our country, to give the younger before
the firstborn.

31 ¶ And when the LORD saw that Leah
was hated, he opened her womb: but Rachel
was barren.
32 And Leah conceived, and bare a son;
and she called his name Reuben: for she
said, Surely the LORD hath looked upon my
affliction; now therefore my husband will
love me.
33 And she conceived again, and bare a son;
and said, Because the LORD hath heard that
I *was* hated, he hath therefore given me this
son also: and she called his name Simeon.
34 And she conceived again, and bare a
son; and said, Now this time will my husband
be joined unto me, because I have borne him

three sons: therefore was his name called
Levi.
35 And she conceived again, and bare a
son; and she said, Now will I praise the
LORD: therefore she called his name Judah;
and left bearing.

Genesis XXX

9 When Leah saw that she had left bearing,
she took Zilpah her maid, and gave her Jacob
to wife.
10 And Zilpah Leah's maid bare Jacob a son.

11 And Leah said, A troop cometh: and she
called his name Gad.
12 And Zilpah Leah's maid bare Jacob a sec-
ond son.
13 And Leah said, Happy am I, for the
daughters will call me blessed: and she
called his name Asher.

14 ¶ And Reuben went in the days of wheat harvest, and found mandrakes in the field, and brought them unto his mother Leah. Then Rachel said to Leah, Give me, I pray thee, of thy son's mandrakes.

15 And she said unto her, *Is it* a small matter that thou hast taken my husband? and wouldest thou take away my son's mandrakes also? And Rachel said, Therefore he shall lie with thee to night for thy son's mandrakes.

16 And Jacob came out of the field in the evening, and Leah went out to meet him, and said, Thou must come in unto me; for surely I have hired thee with my son's mandrakes. And he lay with her that night.

now will my husband dwell with me, because I have borne him six sons: and she called his name Zebulun.

24 And she called his name Joseph; and said, The LORD shall add to me another son.

25 ¶ And it came to pass, when Rachel had borne Joseph, that Jacob said unto Laban, Send me away, that I may go unto mine own place, and to my country.

27 And Laban said unto him, I pray thee, if I have found favour in thine eyes, *tarry: for* I have learned by experience that the LORD hath blessed me for thy sake.

29 And he said unto him, Thou knowest how I have served thee, and how thy cattle was with me.

30 For *it was* little which thou hadst before I *came*, and it is *now* increased unto a multitude; and the LORD hath blessed thee since my coming: and now, when shall I provide for mine own house also?

31 And he said, What shall I give thee? And Jacob said, Thou shalt not give me any thing: if thou wilt do this thing for me, I will again feed *and* keep thy flock.

32 ~~I will pass through all thy flock to-day~~, removing from thence all the speckled and spotted cattle, ~~and all the brown cattle among the sheep, and the spotted and speckled~~

35 And he removed that day the he goats that were ringstreaked and spotted, and all the she goats that were speckled and spotted, *and* every one that had *some* white in it, and ~~all the brown among the sheep~~, and gave *them* into the hand of his sons.

36 And he set three days' journey betwixt himself and Jacob: and Jacob fed the rest of Laban's flocks.

37 ¶ And Jacob took him rods of green poplar, and of the hazel and chesnut tree; and pilled white streaks in them, and made the white appear which *was* in the rods.

38 And he set the rods which he had pilled before the flocks in the gutters ~~in the watering troughs when the flocks came to drink~~, that they should conceive when they came to drink.

39 ~~And the flocks conceived before the rods~~, and brought forth cattle ringstreaked, speckled, and spotted.

40 And Jacob did separate the lambs, ~~and set the faces of the flocks toward the ringstreaked, and all the brown in the flock of Laban~~; and he put his own flocks by themselves, and put them not unto Laban's cattle.

41 And it came to pass, whensoever the stronger cattle did conceive, that Jacob laid the rods before the eyes of the cattle in the gutters, that they might conceive among the rods.
42 But when the cattle were feeble, he put *them* not in: so the feebler were Laban's, and the stronger Jacob's.
43 And the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maidservants, and menservants, and camels, and asses.

Genesis XXXI

AND he heard the words of Laban's sons, saying, Jacob hath taken away all that *was* our father's; and of *that* which *was* our father's hath he gotten all this glory.

3 And the LORD said unto Jacob, Return unto the land of thy fathers, and to thy kindred; and I will be with thee.

19 And Laban went to shear his sheep:

21 So he fled with all that he had; and he rose up, and passed over the river, and set his face *toward* the mount Gilead.
22 And it was told Laban on the third day, that Jacob was fled.
23 And he took his brethren with him, and pursued after him seven days' journey; and they overtook him in the mount Gilead.

Now Jacob had pitched his tent in the mount: and Laban with his brethren pitched in the mount of Gilead.

27 Wherefore didst thou flee away secretly, and steal away from me; and didst not tell me, that I might have sent thee away with mirth, and with songs, with tabret, and with harp?

31 And Jacob answered and said to Laban, ~~Because I was afraid~~: for I said, Peradventure thou wouldest take by force thy daughters from me.

36 ¶ And Jacob was wroth, and chode with Laban:

38 This twenty years *have* I *been* with thee; thy ewes and thy she goats have not cast their young, and the rams of thy flock have I not eaten.
39 That which was torn *of beasts* I brought not unto thee; I bare the loss of it; of my hand didst thou require it, *whether* stolen by day, or stolen by night.
40 *Thus* I was; in the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night; and my sleep departed from mine eyes.

44 Now therefore come thou, let us make a covenant, I and thou; and let it be for a witness between me and thee.

46 And Jacob said unto his brethren, Gather stones; and they took stones, and made a heap: and they did eat there upon the heap.

48 And Laban said, This heap *is* a witness between me and thee this day. Therefore was the name of it called Galeed,

51 And Laban said to Jacob, Behold this heap, ~~and behold *this* pillar~~, which I have cast betwixt me and thee;

52 This heap *be* witness, ~~and *this* pillar *be* witness~~, that I will not pass over this heap to thee, and that thou shalt not pass over this heap ~~and this pillar~~ unto me, for harm.

53 The God of Abraham, and the God of Nahor, the God of their father, judge betwixt us.

Genesis XXXII

3 And Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother unto the land of Seir, the country of Edom.

4 And he commanded them, saying, Thus shall ye speak unto my lord Esau; Thy servant Jacob saith thus, I have sojourned with Laban, and stayed there until now:

5 And I have oxen, and asses, flocks, and menservants, and womenservants: and I have sent to tell my lord, that I may find grace in thy sight.

6 ¶ And the messengers returned to Jacob, saying, We came to thy brother Esau, and also he cometh to meet thee, and four hundred men with him.

7 Then Jacob was greatly afraid and distressed: and he divided the people that *was* with him, and the flocks, and herds, and the camels, into two bands;

8 And said, If Esau come to the one company, and smite it, then the other company which is left shall escape.

13 ¶ And he lodged there that same night;

22 And he rose up that night, and took his two wives, and his two womenservants, and his eleven sons, ~~and passed over the ford Jabbok~~.

23 And he took them, and sent them over the brook, ~~and sent over that he had~~.

24 ¶ And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.

25 ~~And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh~~; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him.

26 ~~And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me~~.

27 And he said unto him, What *is* thy name? And he said, Jacob.

28 And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.

31 And as he passed over Penuel the sun rose upon him, and he halted upon his thigh.

Genesis XXXIII

AND Jacob lifted up his eyes, and looked, and, behold, Esau came, and with him four hundred men. And he divided the children unto Leah, and unto Rachel, and unto the two handmaids.
2 And he put the handmaids and their children foremost, and Leah and her children after, and Rachel and Joseph hindermost.
3 And he passed over before them, and bowed himself to the ground seven times, until he came near to his brother.
4 And Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck, and kissed him: and they wept.

6 Then the handmaidens came near, they and their children, and they bowed themselves.
7 And Leah also with her children came near, and bowed themselves: and after came Joseph near and Rachel, and they bowed themselves.
8 And he said, What *meanest* thou by all this drove which I met? And he said, *These are* to find grace in the sight of my lord.

9 And Esau said, I have enough, my brother; keep that thou hast unto thyself.
10 And Jacob said, Nay, I pray thee, if now I have found grace in thy sight, then receive my present at my hand: for therefore I have seen thy face, as though I had seen the face of God, and thou wast pleased with me.

And he urged him, and he took *it*.
12 And he said, Let us take our journey, and let us go, and I will go before thee.
13 And he said unto him, My lord knoweth that the children *are* tender, and the flocks and herds with young *are* with me; and if men should overdrive them one day, all the flock will die.
14 Let my lord, I pray thee, pass over before his servant; and I will lead on softly, according as the cattle that goeth before me and the children be able to endure, until I come unto my lord unto Seir.
15 And Esau said, Let me now leave with thee *some* of the folk that *are* with me. And he said, What needeth it? let me find grace in the sight of my lord.
16 ¶ So Esau returned that day on his way unto Seir.
17 And Jacob journeyed to Succoth, and built him a house, and made booths for his cattle: therefore the name of the place is called Succoth.

Genesis XXXVII (analysis uncertain)

Genesis XXXIX

AND Joseph was brought down to Egypt; and ~~Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, captain of the guard~~, an Egyptian, bought him of the hands of the Ishmaelites, which had brought him down thither.
2 And the LORD was with Joseph, and he was a prosperous man; and he was in the house of his master the Egyptian.
3 And his master saw that the LORD *was* with him, and that the LORD made all that he did to prosper in his hand.
4 And Joseph found grace in his sight, and he served him: and he made him overseer over his house, and all *that* he had he put into his hand.
5 And it came to pass from the time *that* he had made him overseer in his house, and over all that he had, that the LORD blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake; and the blessing of the LORD was upon all that he had in the house, and in the field.
6 And he left all that he had in Joseph's hand; and he knew not aught he had, save the bread which he did eat. And Joseph was a goodly person, and well favoured.
7 ¶ And it came to pass after these things, that his master's wife cast her eyes upon Joseph; and she said, Lie with me.
8 But he refused, and said unto his master's wife, Behold, my master wotteth not what *is* with me in the house, and he hath committed all that he hath to my hand;
9 *There is* none greater in this house than *I*; neither hath he kept back any thing from me but thee, because thou *art* his wife: how then can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?
10 And it came to pass, as she spake to Joseph day by day, that he hearkened not unto her, to lie by her, *or* to be with her.
11 And it came to pass about this time, that *Joseph* went into the house to do his business; and *there was* none of the men of the house there within.
12 And she caught him by his garment, saying, Lie with me: and he left his garment in her hand, and fled, and got him out.
13 And it came to pass, when she saw that he had left his garment in her hand, and was fled forth,
14 That she called unto the men of her house, and spake unto them, saying, See, he hath brought in a Hebrew unto us to mock us; he came in unto me to lie with me, and I cried with a loud voice:
15 And it came to pass, when he heard that I lifted up my voice and cried, that he left his garment with me, and fled, and got him out.
16 And she laid up his garment by her, until his lord came home.
17 And she spake unto him according to these words, saying, The Hebrew servant, which thou hast brought unto us, came in unto me to mock me:
18 And it came to pass, as I lifted up my voice and cried, that he left his garment with me, and fled out.

19 And it came to pass, when his master heard the words of his wife, which she spake unto him, saying, After this manner did thy servant to me; that his wrath was kindled.
20 And Joseph's master took him, and put him into the prison, a place where the king's prisoners *were* bound: and he was there in the prison.
21 ¶ But the LORD was with Joseph, and shewed him mercy, and gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison.

22 And the keeper of the prison committed to Joseph's hand all the prisoners that *were* in the prison; and whatsoever they did there, he was the doer *of it*.
23 The keeper of the prison looked not to any thing *that was* under his hand; because the LORD was with him, and *that* which he did, the LORD made *it* to prosper.

Genesis XL

AND it came to pass after these things, *that* the butler of the king of Egypt and *his* baker had offended their lord the king of Egypt.

the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt, which *were* bound in the prison.

and here also have I done nothing that they should put me into the dungeon.

Genesis XLI (analysis uncertain)

Genesis XLII (analysis uncertain)

Genesis XLIII

AND the famine *was* sore in the land.
2 And it came to pass, when they had eaten up the corn which they had brought out of Egypt, their father said unto them, Go again, buy us a little food.
3 And Judah spake unto him, saying, The man did solemnly protest unto us, saying, Ye shall not see my face, except your brother *be* with you.
4 If thou wilt send our brother with us, we will go down and buy thee food:
5 But if thou wilt not send *him*, we will not go down: for the man said unto us, Ye shall not see my face, except your brother *be* with you.
6 And Israel said, Wherefore dealt ye *so* ill with me, *as* to tell the man whether ye had yet a brother?
7 And they said, The man asked us straitly of our state, and of our kindred, saying, *Is* your father yet alive? have ye *another* brother? and we told him according to the tenor of these words: Could we certainly know that he would say, Bring your brother down?
8 And Judah said unto Israel his father, Send the lad with me, and we will arise and go; that we may live, and not die, both we, and thou, *and* also our little ones.
9 I will be surety for him; of my hand shalt thou require him: if I bring him not unto thee, and set him before thee, then let me bear the blame for ever:
10 For except we had lingered, surely now we had returned this second time.
11 And their father Israel said unto them, If *it must be* so now, do this; take of the best fruits in the land in your vessels, and carry down the man a present, a little balm, and a little honey, spices and myrrh, nuts and almonds:
12 And take double money in your hand; and the money that was brought again in the mouth of your sacks, carry *it* again in your hand; peradventure it *was* an oversight.
13 Take also your brother, and arise, go again unto the man:
15 ¶ And the men took that present, and they took double money in their hand, and Benjamin; and rose up, and went down to Egypt, and stood before Joseph.
16 And when Joseph saw Benjamin with them, he said to the ruler of his house, Bring *these* men home, and slay, and make ready; for *these* men shall dine with me at noon.
17 And the man did as Joseph bade; and the man brought the men into Joseph's house.
18 And the men were afraid, because they were brought into Joseph's house; and they said, Because of the money that was returned in our sacks at the first time are we brought in; that he may seek occasion against us, and fall upon us, and take us for bondmen, and our asses.
19 And they came near to the steward of Joseph's house, and they communed with him at the door of the house,
20 And said, O sir, we came indeed down at the first time to buy food:
21 And it came to pass, when we came to

the inn, that we opened our sacks, and, behold, *every* man's money *was* in the mouth of his sack, our money in full weight: and we have brought it again in our hand.
22 And other money have we brought down in our hands to buy food: we cannot tell who put our money in our sacks.
23 And he said, Peace *be* to you, fear not: your God, and the God of your father, hath given you treasure in your sacks: I had your money.
24 And the man brought the men into Joseph's house, and gave *them* water, and they washed their feet; and he gave their asses provender.
25 And they made ready the present against Joseph came at noon: for they heard that they should eat bread there.
26 ¶ And when Joseph came home, they brought him the present which *was* in their hand into the house, and bowed themselves to him to the earth.
27 And he asked them of *their* welfare, and said, *Is* your father well, the old man of whom ye spake? *Is* he yet alive?
28 And they answered, Thy servant our father *is* in good health, he *is* yet alive. And they bowed down their heads, and made obeisance.
29 And he lifted up his eyes, and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, *Is* this your younger brother, of whom ye spake unto me? And he said, God be gracious unto thee, my son.
30 And Joseph made haste; for his bowels did yearn upon his brother: and he sought *where* to weep; and he entered into *his* chamber, and wept there.
31 And he washed his face, and went out, and refrained himself, and said, Set on bread.
32 And they set on for him by himself, and for them by themselves, and for the Egyptians, which did eat with him, by themselves: because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that *is* an abomination unto the Egyptians.
33 And they sat before him, the firstborn according to his birthright, and the youngest according to his youth: and the men marvelled one at another.
34 And he took *and sent* messes unto them from before him: but Benjamin's mess was five times so much as any of theirs. And they drank, and were merry with him.

Genesis XLIV

AND he commanded the steward of his house, saying, Fill the men's sacks *with* food, as much as they can carry, and put every man's money in his sack's mouth.
2 And put my cup, the silver cup, in the sack's mouth of the youngest, and his corn money. And he did according to the word that Joseph had spoken.
3 As soon as the morning was light, the men were sent away, they and their asses.
4 *And* when they were gone out of the city, *and* not *yet* far off, Joseph said unto his steward, Up, follow after the men; and when thou dost overtake them, say unto them, Wherefore have ye rewarded evil for good?

5 *Is* not this *it* in which my lord drinketh, and whereby indeed he divineth? ye have done evil in so doing.
6 ¶ And he overtook them, and he spake unto them these same words.
7 And they said unto him, Wherefore saith my lord these words? God forbid that thy servants should do according to this thing:
8 Behold, the money, which we found in our sacks' mouths, we brought again unto thee out of the land of Canaan: how then should we steal out of thy lord's house silver or gold?
9 With whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen.
10 And he said, Now also *let* it *be* according unto your words: he with whom it is found shall be my servant; and ye shall be blameless.
11 Then they speedily took down every man his sack to the ground, and opened every man his sack.
12 And he searched, *and* began at the eldest, and left at the youngest: and the cup was found in Benjamin's sack.
13 Then they rent their clothes, and laded every man his ass, and returned to the city.
14 ¶ And Judah and his brethren came to Joseph's house; for he *was* yet there: and they fell before him on the ground.
15 And Joseph said unto them, What deed *is* this that ye have done? wot ye not that such a man as I can certainly divine?
16 And Judah said, What shall we say unto my lord? what shall we speak? or how shall we clear ourselves? God hath found out the iniquity of thy servants: behold, we *are* my lord's servants, both we, and *he* also with whom the cup is found.
17 And he said, God forbid that I should do so: *but* the man in whose hand the cup is found, he shall be my servant; and as for you, get you up in peace unto your father.
18 ¶ Then Judah came near unto him, and said, O my lord, let thy servant, I pray thee, speak a word in my lord's ears, and let not thine anger burn against thy servant: for thou *art* even as Pharaoh.
19 My lord asked his servants, saying, Have ye a father, or a brother?
20 And we said unto my lord, We have a father, an old man, and a child of his old age, a little one; and his brother is dead, and he alone is left of his mother, and his father loveth him.
21 And thou saidst unto thy servants, Bring him down unto me, that I may set mine eyes upon him.
22 And we said unto my lord, The lad cannot leave his father: for *if* he should leave his father, *his father* would die.
23 And thou saidst unto thy servants, Except your youngest brother come down with you, ye shall see my face no more.
24 And it came to pass when we came up unto thy servant my father, we told him the words of my lord.
25 And our father said, Go again, *and* buy us a little food.
26 And we said, We cannot go down: if our youngest brother be with us, then will we go down: for we may not see the man's

face, except our youngest brother *be* with us.
27 And thy servant my father said unto us, Ye know that my wife bare me two *sons:*
28 And the one went out from me, and I said, Surely he is torn in pieces; and I saw him not since:
29 And if ye take this also from me, and mischief befall him, ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow to the grave.
30 Now therefore when I come to thy servant my father, and the lad *be* not with us; seeing that his life is bound up in the lad's life;
31 It shall come to pass, when he seeth that the lad *is* not *with us*, that he will die: and thy servants shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow to the grave.
32 For thy servant became surety for the lad unto my father, saying, If I bring him not unto thee, then I shall bear the blame to my father for ever.
33 Now therefore, I pray thee, let thy servant abide instead of the lad a bondman to my lord; and let the lad go up with his brethren.
34 For how shall I go up to my father, and the lad *be* not with me? lest peradventure I see the evil that shall come on my father.

Genesis XLV (analysis uncertain)

Genesis XLVI

AND Israel took his journey with all that he had,
28 ¶ And he sent Judah before him unto Joseph, to direct his face unto Goshen; and they came into the land of Goshen.
29 And Joseph made ready his chariot, and went up to meet Israel his father, to Goshen, and presented himself unto him; and he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while.
30 And Israel said unto Joseph, Now let me die, since I have seen thy face, because thou *art* yet alive.
31 And Joseph said unto his brethren, and unto his father's house, I will go up, and shew Pharaoh, and say unto him, My brethren, and my father's house, which *were* in the land of Canaan, are come unto me;
32 And the men *are* shepherds, for their trade hath been to feed cattle; and they have brought their flocks, and their herds, and all that they have.
33 And it shall come to pass, when Pharaoh shall call you, and shall say, What *is* your occupation?
34 That ye shall say, Thy servants' trade hath been about cattle from our youth even until now, both we, *and* also our fathers: that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen;

Genesis XLVII

THEN Joseph came and told Pharaoh, and said, My father and my brethren, and their flocks, and their herds, and all that they have, are come out of the land of Canaan; and, behold, they *are* in the land of Goshen.

2 And he took some of his brethren, *even* five men, and presented them unto Pharaoh.

3 And Pharaoh said unto his brethren, What *is* your occupation? And they said unto Pharaoh, Thy servants *are* shepherds, both we, *and* also our fathers.

4 They said moreover unto Pharaoh, For to sojourn in the land are we come; for thy servants have no pasture for their flocks; for the famine *is* sore in the land of Canaan: now therefore, we pray thee, let thy servants dwell in the land of Goshen.

5 And Pharaoh spake unto Joseph, saying,

in the land of Goshen let them dwell: and if thou knowest *any* men of activity among them, then make them rulers over my cattle.

13 ¶ And *there was* no bread in all the land; for the famine *was* very sore, so that the land of Egypt and *all* the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine.

14 And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house.

15 And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said, Give us bread: for why should we die in thy presence? for the money faileth.

16 And Joseph said, Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail.

17 And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread *in exchange* for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses; and he fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year.

18 When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year, and said unto him, We will not hide *it* from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is not aught left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands:

19 Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our land? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give *us* seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate.

20 And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh's.

21 And as for the people, he removed them to cities from *one* end of the borders of Egypt even to the *other* end thereof.

22 Only the land of the priests bought he not; for the priests had a portion *assigned them* of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands.

23 Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh: lo, *here is* seed for you, and ye shall sow the land.
24 And it shall come to pass in the increase, that ye shall give the fifth *part* unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones.
25 And they said, Thou hast saved our lives:

let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh's servants.
26 And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, *that* Pharaoh should have the fifth *part;* except the land of the priests only, *which* became not Pharaoh's.
27 ¶ And Israel dwelt ~~in the land of Egypt~~, in the country of Goshen;

29 And the time drew nigh that Israel must die: and he called his son Joseph, and said unto him, If now I have found grace in thy sight, put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and deal kindly and truly with me; bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt:
30 But I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their buryingplace. And he said, I will do as thou hast said.
31 And he said, Swear unto me. And he sware unto him. And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head.

Genesis XLVIII

and Israel strengthened himself, and sat upon the bed.

~~*place*~~. And he said, Bring them, I pray thee, unto me, and I will bless them.
10 Now the eyes of Israel were dim for age, *so that* he could not see.

13 And Joseph took them both, Ephraim in his right hand toward Israel's left hand, and Manasseh in his left hand toward Israel's right hand, and brought *them* near unto him.
14 And Israel stretched out his right hand, and laid *it* upon Ephraim's head, who *was* the younger, and his left hand upon Manasseh's head, guiding his hands wittingly; for Manasseh *was* the firstborn.
17 And when Joseph saw that his father laid his right hand upon the head of Ephraim, it displeased him: and he held up his father's hand, to remove it from Ephraim's head unto Manasseh's head.
18 And Joseph said unto his father, Not so, my father: for this *is* the firstborn; put thy right hand upon his head.
19 And his father refused, and said, I know *it*, my son, I know *it:* he also shall become a people, and he also shall be great: but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations.
20 And he blessed them that day,

Genesis L

AND Joseph fell upon his father's face, and wept upon him, and kissed him.

and the physicians embalmed Israel.

3 (analysis uncertain)

4 And when the days of his mourning were past, Joseph spake unto the house of Pharaoh, saying, If now I have found grace in your eyes, speak, I pray you, in the ears of Pharaoh, saying,
5 My father made me swear, saying, Lo, I die: in my grave which I have digged for me in the land of Canaan, there shalt thou bury me. Now therefore let me go up, I pray thee, and bury my father, and I will come again.
6 And Pharaoh said, Go up, and bury thy father, according as he made thee swear.
7 ¶ And Joseph went up to bury his father: and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt,

8 And all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his father's house: only their little ones, and their flocks, and their herds, they left in the land of Goshen.
9 And there went up with him both chariots and horsemen: and it was a very great company.
10 And they came to the threshingfloor of Atad, which *is* beyond Jordan; and there they mourned with a great and very sore lamentation: and he made a mourning for his father seven days.
11 And when the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites, saw the mourning in the floor of Atad, they said, This *is* a grievous mourning to the Egyptians: wherefore the name of it was called Abel-mizraim, which *is* beyond Jordan.

14 ¶ And Joseph returned into Egypt, he, and his brethren, and all that went up with him to bury his father, after he had buried his father.

Exodus I

6 And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation.
8 Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph.
9 And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel *are* more and mightier than we:
10 Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and *so* get them up out of the land.

Exodus II

11 ¶ And it came to pass in those days, when Moses was grown, that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens: and he spied an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, one of his brethren.
12 And he looked this way and that way, and when he saw that *there was* no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid him in the sand.
13 And when he went out the second day, behold, two men of the Hebrews strove together: and he said to him that did the wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow?
14 And he said, Who made thee a prince and a judge over us? intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian? And Moses feared, and said, Surely this thing is known.
15 Now when Pharaoh heard this thing, he sought to slay Moses. But Moses fled from the face of Pharaoh, and dwelt in the land of Midian: and he sat down by a well.
16 Now the priest of Midian had seven daughters: and they came and drew *water*, and filled the troughs to water their father's flock.
17 And the shepherds came and drove them away: but Moses stood up and helped them, and watered their flock.
18 And when they came to ~~Reuel~~ their father, he said, How *is it that* ye are come so soon to day?
19 And they said, An Egyptian delivered us out of the hand of the shepherds, and also drew *water* enough for us, and watered the flock.
20 And he said unto his daughters, And where *is* he? why *is* it *that* ye have left the man? call him, that he may eat bread.
21 And Moses was content to dwell with the man: and he gave Moses Zipporah his daughter.
22 And she bare *him* a son, and he called his name Gershom: for he said, I have been a stranger in a strange land.
23 ¶ And it came to pass in process of time, that the king of Egypt died:

Exodus III

2 And the Angel of the LORD appeared un-

to him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush *was* not consumed.
3 And Moses said, I will now turn aside, and see this great sight, why the bush is not burnt.
4 And when the LORD saw that he turned aside to see,

5 And he said, Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet; for the place whereon thou standest *is* holy ground.

7 ¶ And the LORD said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which *are* in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters;

8 And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land

18 (analysis uncertain)

Exodus IV

19 And the LORD said unto Moses in Midian,

Go, return into Egypt: for all the men are dead which sought thy life.
20 And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon an ass, and he returned to the land of Egypt:

24 ¶ And it came to pass by the way in the inn, that the LORD met him, and sought to kill him.
25 Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast *it* at his feet, and said, Surely a bloody husband *art* thou to me.
26 So he let him go: then she said, A bloody husband *thou art*, because of the circumcision.

Exodus V

AND afterward Moses ~~and Aaron~~ went in, and told Pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD God of Israel, Let my people go, that they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness.
2 And Pharaoh said, Who *is* the LORD, that I should obey his voice to let Israel go? I know not the LORD, neither will I let Israel go.

5 And Pharaoh said, Behold, the people of the land now *are* many, and ye make them rest from their burdens.
6 And Pharaoh commanded the same day the

taskmasters of the people, and their officers, saying,
7 Ye shall no more give the people straw to make brick, as heretofore: let them go and gather straw for themselves.

9 Let there more work be laid upon the men, that they may labour therein; and let them not regard vain words.
10 ¶ And the taskmasters of the people went out, and their officers, and they spake to the people, saying, Thus saith Pharaoh, I will not give you straw.
11 Go ye, get you straw where ye can find it:
12 So the people were scattered abroad throughout all the land of Egypt to gather stubble instead of straw.
13 And the taskmasters hasted *them*, saying, Fulfil your works, *your* daily tasks, as when there was straw.
14 And the officers of the children of Israel, which Pharaoh's taskmasters had set over them, were beaten, *and* demanded, Wherefore have ye not fulfilled your task in making brick both yesterday and to day, as heretofore?
15 ¶ Then the officers of the children of Israel came and cried unto Pharaoh, saying, Wherefore dealest thou thus with thy servants?

16 There is no straw given unto thy servants, and they say to us, Make brick: and, behold, thy servants *are* beaten; but the fault *is* in thine own people.
17 But he said, Ye *are* idle, *ye are* idle: therefore ye say, Let us go *and* do sacrifice to the LORD.
18 Go therefore now, *and* work; for there shall no straw be given you, yet shall ye deliver the tale of bricks.
19 And the officers of the children of Israel did see *that* they *were* in evil *case*, after it was said, Ye shall not minish *aught* from your bricks of your daily task.
20 ¶ And they met Moses ~~and Aaron~~, who stood in the way, as they came forth from Pharaoh:
21 And they said unto them, The LORD look upon you, and judge; because ye have made our savour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants, to put a sword in their hand to slay us.
22 And Moses returned unto the LORD, and said, Lord, wherefore hast thou *so* evil entreated this people? why *is* it *that* thou hast sent me?
23 For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name, he hath done evil to this people; neither hast thou delivered thy people at all.

Exodus VII

14 ¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, Pharaoh's heart *is* hardened, he refuseth to let the people go.
15 Get thee unto Pharaoh in the morning; lo, he goeth out unto the water;

16 And thou shalt say unto him, The LORD God of the Hebrews hath sent me unto thee, saying, Let my people go, that they may serve me in the wilderness: and, behold, hitherto thou wouldest not hear.
17 Thus saith the LORD, In this thou shalt know that I *am* the LORD:

the fish that *is* in the river shall die, and the river shall stink; and the Egyptians shall loathe to drink of the water of the river.

21 And the fish that *was* in the river died; and the river stank, and the Egyptians could not drink of the water of the river;

25 And seven days were fulfilled, after that the LORD had smitten the river.

AND the LORD spake unto Moses, Go unto Pharaoh, and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Let my people go, that they may serve me.
2 And if thou refuse to let *them* go, behold, I will smite all thy borders with frogs:

3 And the river shall bring forth frogs abundantly, which shall go up and come into thine house, and into thy bedchamber, and upon thy bed, and into the house of thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thine ovens, and into thy kneadingtroughs:
4 And the frogs shall come up both on thee, and upon thy people, and upon all thy servants.

Exodus VIII

8 ¶ Then Pharaoh called for Moses ~~and Aaron~~, and said, Entreat the LORD, that he may take away the frogs from me, and from my people; and I will let the people go, that they may do sacrifice unto the LORD.
9 And Moses said unto Pharaoh, Glory over me: when shall I entreat for thee, and for thy servants, and for thy people, to destroy the frogs from thee and thy houses, *that* they may remain in the river only?
10 And he said, To morrow. And he said, *Be it* according to thy word;

11 And the frogs shall depart from thee, and from thy houses, and from thy servants,

and from thy people; they shall remain in
the river only.
12 And Moses ~~and Aaron~~ went out from
Pharaoh: and Moses cried unto the LORD be-
cause of the frogs which he had brought
against Pharaoh.
13 And the LORD did according to the word
of Moses; and the frogs died out of the houses,
out of the villages, and out of the fields.
14 And they gathered them together upon
heaps; and the land stank.
15 But when Pharaoh saw that there was
respite, he hardened his heart,

20 ¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, Rise
up early in the morning, and stand before
Pharaoh; lo, he cometh forth to the water;
and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD, Let
my people go, that they may serve me.

21 Else, if thou wilt not let my people go,
behold, I will send swarms of flies upon thee,
and upon thy servants, and upon thy people,
and into thy houses: and the houses of the
Egyptians shall be full of swarms of flies, and
also the ground whereon they *are*.
22 And I will sever in that day the land of
Goshen, in which my people dwell, that no
swarms of flies shall be there;

23 And I will put a division between my
people and thy people: to morrow shall this
~~sign~~ be.
24 And the LORD did so; and there came a
grievous swarm of flies into the house of
Pharaoh, and *into* his servants' houses, and
into all the land of Egypt: the land was cor-
rupted by reason of the swarm of flies.
25 ¶ And Pharaoh called for Moses ~~and for~~
~~Aaron,~~ and said, Go ye, sacrifice to your
God in the land.
26 And Moses said, It is not meet so to do;
for we shall sacrifice the abomination of the
Egyptians to the LORD our God: lo, shall we
sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians be-
fore their eyes, and will they not stone us?
27 We will go three days' journey into the
wilderness, and sacrifice to the LORD our God,
as he shall command us.
28 And Pharaoh said, I will let you go, that
ye may sacrifice to the LORD your God in
the wilderness; only ye shall not go very far
away: entreat for me.
29 And Moses said, Behold, I go out from
thee, and I will entreat the LORD that the

swarms of flies may depart from Pharaoh,
from his servants, and from his people, to
morrow: but let not Pharaoh deal deceitfully
any more in not letting the people go to
sacrifice to the LORD.
30 And Moses went out from Pharaoh, and
entreated the LORD.
31 And the LORD did according to the word
of Moses; and he removed the swarms of
flies from Pharaoh, from his servants, and
from his people; there remained not one.
32 And Pharaoh hardened his heart at this
time also, neither would he let the people
go.

Exodus IX

THEN the LORD said unto Moses, Go in
unto Pharaoh, and tell him, Thus saith
the LORD God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that they may serve me.
2 For if thou refuse to let *them* go, and
wilt hold them still,
3 Behold, the hand of the LORD is upon thy
cattle which *is* in the field,

there shall be a
very grievous murrain.
4 And the LORD shall sever between the
cattle of Israel and the cattle of Egypt: and
there shall nothing die of all *that is* the children's of Israel.
5 And the LORD appointed a set time, saying, To morrow the LORD shall do this thing
in the land.
6 And the LORD did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle of Egypt died: but

of the cattle of the children of Israel died not
one.
7 And Pharaoh sent, and, behold, there was
not one of the cattle of the Israelites dead.
And the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, and
he did not let the people go.

13 ¶ And the LORD said unto Moses, Rise up
early in the morning, and stand before Pharaoh, and say unto him, Thus saith the LORD
God of the Hebrews, Let my people go, that
they may serve me.

17 As yet exaltest thou thyself against my
people, that thou wilt not let them go?
18 Behold, to morrow about this time I will
cause it to rain a very grievous hail, such as
hath not been in Egypt since the foundation
thereof even until now.

and
the LORD rained hail upon the land of Egypt.

very grievous, such as there was
none like it in all the land of Egypt since it
became a nation.

and the hail smote every
herb of the field, and brake every tree of the
field.
26 Only in the land of Goshen, where the
children of Israel *were*, was there no hail.

27 (analysis uncertain)

28 Entreat the LORD (for *it is* enough) that
there be no *more* mighty thunderings and
hail; and I will let you go, and ye shall stay
no longer.
29 And Moses said unto him, As soon as I
am gone out of the city, I will spread abroad
my hands unto the LORD; *and* the thunder
shall cease, neither shall there be any more
hail;

33 And Moses went out of the city from Pharaoh, and spread abroad his hands unto the
LORD: and the thunders and hail ceased, and
the rain was not poured upon the earth.
34 And when Pharaoh saw that the rain and

the hail and the thunders were ceased, he
sinned yet more, and hardened his heart, he
and his servants.

Exodus X

AND the LORD said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh:

3 And Moses ~~and Aaron~~ came in unto Pharaoh, and said unto him, Thus saith the LORD God of the Hebrews, How long wilt thou refuse to humble thyself before me? let my people go, that they may serve me.
4 Else, if thou refuse to let my people go, behold, to morrow will I bring the locusts into thy coast:
5 And they shall cover the face of the earth, that one cannot be able to see the earth: and they shall eat the residue of that which is escaped, which remaineth unto you from the hail, and shall eat every tree which groweth for you out of the field:
6 And they shall fill thy houses, and the houses of all thy servants, and the houses of all the Egyptians, which neither thy fathers, nor thy fathers' fathers have seen, since the day that they were upon the earth unto this day. And he turned himself, and went out from Pharaoh.
7 And Pharaoh's servants said unto him, How long shall this man be a snare unto us? let the men go, that they may serve the LORD their God: knowest thou not yet that Egypt is destroyed?
8 And Moses ~~and Aaron~~ were brought again unto Pharaoh: and he said unto them, Go, serve the LORD your God: *but* who *are* they that shall go?
9 And Moses said, We will go with our young and with our old, with our sons and with our daughters, with our flocks and with our herds will we go; for we *must hold* a feast unto the LORD.
10 And he said unto them, Let the LORD be so with you, as I will let you go, and your little ones: look *to it;* for evil *is* before you.
11 Not so: go now ye *that are* men, and serve the LORD; for that ye did desire. And they were driven out from Pharaoh's presence.

and the LORD brought an east wind upon the land all that day, and all *that* night; *and* when it was morning, the east wind brought the locusts.

and rested in all the coasts of Egypt: very grievous *were they;* before them there were no such locusts as they, neither after them shall be such.
15 For they covered the face of the whole earth, so that the land was darkened; and they did eat every herb of the land, and all the fruit of the trees which the hail had left:
16 ¶ Then Pharaoh called for Moses ~~and Aaron~~ in haste; and he said, I have sinned against the LORD your God, and against you.
17 Now therefore forgive, I pray thee, my sin only this once, and entreat the LORD your God, that he may take away from me this death only.
18 And he went out from Pharaoh, and entreated the LORD.
19 And the LORD turned a mighty strong west wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red sea; there remained not one locust in all the coasts of Egypt.

24 ¶ And Pharaoh called unto Moses, and

said, Go ye, serve the LORD; only let your
flocks and your herds be stayed: let your
little ones also go with you.
25 And Moses said, Thou must give us also
sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may
sacrifice unto the LORD our God.
26 Our cattle also shall go with us; there
shall not a hoof be left behind; for thereof
must we take to serve the LORD our God;
and we know not with what we must serve
the LORD, until we come thither.

28 And Pharaoh said unto him, Get thee
from me, take heed to thyself, see my face
no more; for in *that* day thou seest my face
thou shalt die.
29 And Moses said, Thou hast spoken well,
I will see thy face again no more.

Exodus XI

4 And Moses said, Thus saith the LORD.

About midnight will I go out into the midst
of Egypt:
5 And all the firstborn in the land of Egypt
shall die, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that
sitteth upon his throne, even unto the first-
born of the maidservant that *is* behind the
mill; and all the firstborn of beasts.
6 And there shall be a great cry throughout
all the land of Egypt, such as there was none
like it, nor shall be like it any more.
7 But against any of the children of Israel
shall not a dog move his tongue, against man
or beast: that ye may know how that the LORD
doth put a difference between the Egyptians
and Israel.
8 And all these thy servants shall come
down unto me, and bow down themselves un-
to me, saying, Get thee out, and all the peo-
ple that follow thee: and after that I will go
out. And he went out from Pharaoh in a
great anger.

Exodus XII

29 ¶ And it came to pass, that at midnight
the LORD smote all the firstborn in the land
of Egypt, from the firstborn of Pharaoh that
sat on his throne unto the firstborn of the
captive that *was* in the dungeon; and all the
firstborn of cattle.
30 And Pharaoh rose up in the night, he,
and all his servants, and all the Egyptians;
and there was a great cry in Egypt: for *there
was* not a house where *there was* not one
dead.

31 ¶ And he called for Moses ~~and Aaron~~ by night, and said, Rise up, *and* get you forth from among my people, both ye and the children of Israel; and go, serve the LORD, as ye have said.
32 Also take your flocks and your herds, as ye have said, and be gone; and bless me also.
33 And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste; for they said, We *be* all dead *men.*

38 And a mixed multitude went up also with them; and flocks, and herds, *even* very much cattle.

Exodus XIII

21 And the LORD went before them by day in a pillar of a cloud, to lead them the way; and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; to go by day and night.
22 He took not away the pillar of the cloud by day, nor the pillar of fire by night, *from* before the people.

Exodus XIV

5-7 (analysis uncertain)

10 ¶ And when Pharaoh drew nigh, the children of Israel lifted up their eyes, and, behold, the Egyptians marched after them: and they were sore afraid:

11 And they said unto Moses, Because *there were* no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness? wherefore hast thou dealt thus with us, to carry us forth out of Egypt?
12 *Is* not this the word that we did tell thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians? For *it had been* better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in the wilderness.
13 ¶ And Moses said unto the people, Fear ye not, stand still, and see the salvation of the LORD, which he will shew to you to day: for the Egyptians whom ye have seen to day, ye shall see them again no more for ever.
14 The LORD shall fight for you, and ye shall hold your peace.

and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them:

20 (analysis uncertain)

and the LORD caused the sea to go *back* by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry *land,*

24 And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the LORD looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians,

so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the LORD fighteth for them against the Egyptians.

and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the LORD overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea.

there remained not so much as one of them.

30 Thus the LORD saved Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians; and Israel saw the Egyptians dead upon the sea shore.

Exodus XV

22 So Moses brought Israel from the Red sea, and they went out into the wilderness of Shur; and they went three days in the wilderness, and found no water.
23 ¶ And when they came to Marah, they could not drink of the waters of Marah, for they *were* bitter: therefore the name of it was called Marah.
24 And the people murmured against Moses, saying, What shall we drink?
25 And he cried unto the LORD; and the LORD shewed him a tree, *which* when he had cast into the waters, the waters were made sweet:

27 ¶ And they came to Elim, where *were* twelve wells of water, and threescore and ten palm trees: and they encamped there by the waters.

Exodus XVI (analysis uncertain)

Exodus XVII (analysis uncertain)

Exodus XVIII (analysis uncertain)

Exodus XIX

and were come *to* the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness;

Exodus XXXIV

AND the LORD said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone ~~like unto the first: and I will write upon *these* tables the words that were in the first tables, which thou brakest.~~

2 And be ready in the morning, and come up in the morning unto mount Sinai, and

present thyself there to me in the top of the mount.

4 ¶ And he hewed two tables of stone ~~like unto the first~~; and Moses rose up early in the morning, and went up unto mount Sinai, ~~as the LORD had commanded him~~, and took in his hand the two tables of stone.

28 And he was there with the LORD forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And He wrote upon the tables ~~the words of the covenant~~, the ten commandments.

Numbers X

29 ¶ And Moses said unto Hobab, the son of Raguel the Midianite, Moses' father in law, We are journeying unto the place of which

the LORD said, I will give it you: come thou with us, and we will do thee good: for the LORD hath spoken good concerning Israel.

30 And he said unto him, I will not go; but I will depart to mine own land, and to my kindred.

31 And he said, Leave us not, I pray thee; forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes.

32 And it shall be, if thou go with us, yea, it shall be, that what goodness the LORD shall do unto us, the same will we do unto thee.

Numbers XI (analysis uncertain)

Numbers XIII

and said unto them, Get you up this *way* southward,

19 And what the land *is* that they dwell in, whether it *be* good or bad; and what cities *they be* that they dwell in, whether in tents, or in strong holds;

22 And they ascended by the south, and came unto Hebron; where Ahiman, Sheshai, and Talmai, the children of Anak, *were*.

28 Nevertheless the people *be* strong that dwell in the land, and the cities *are* walled, *and* very great: and moreover we saw the children of Anak there.

30 And Caleb stilled the people before Moses, and said, Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it.
31 But the men that went up with him said, We be not able to go up against the people; for they *are* stronger than we.

Numbers XIV (analysis uncertain)

Numbers XVI (analysis uncertain)

Numbers XXI

AND *when* king Arad the Canaanite, which dwelt in the south, heard tell that Israel came by the way of the spies; then he fought against Israel, and took *some* of them prisoners.
2 And Israel vowed a vow unto the LORD, and said, If thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, then I will utterly destroy their cities.
3 And the LORD hearkened to the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their cities: and he called the name of the place Hormah.

Numbers XXXII (analysis uncertain)

Deuteronomy XXXIV

#

4 And the LORD said unto him, This *is* the land which I sware unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed: I have caused thee to see *it* with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither.

Joshua II

6 But she had brought them up to the roof of the house, and hid them with the stalks of flax, which she had laid in order upon the roof.

8 ¶ And before they were laid down, she came up unto them upon the roof;
9 And she said unto the men, I know that the LORD hath given you the land,

12 Now therefore, I pray you, swear unto me by the LORD, since I have shewed you kindness, that ye will also shew kindness unto my father's house,

14 And the men answered her, Our life for yours, if ye utter not this our business. And it shall be, when the LORD hath given us the land, that we will deal kindly and truly with thee.
15 Then she let them down by a cord through the window: for her house *was* upon the town wall,

Joshua V

13 ¶ And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, behold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him, *Art* thou for us, or for our adversaries?
14 And he said, Nay; but *as* captain of the host of the LORD am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my lord unto his servant?
15 And the captain of the LORD's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest *is* holy. And Joshua did so.

Joshua VII 21-26 (analysis uncertain)

Joshua IX

4 They did work wilily, and went and made
as if they had been ambassadors, and took
old sacks upon their asses, and wine bottles,
old, and rent, and bound up;
5 And old shoes and clouted upon their
feet, and old garments upon them; and all
the bread of their provision was dry *and*
mouldy.

8 And they said unto Joshua, We *are* thy
servants. And Joshua said unto them, Who
are ye? and from whence come ye?
9 And they said unto him, From a very far
country thy servants are come, because of
the name of the LORD thy God:

11 Wherefore our elders and all the inhab-
itants of our country spake to us, saying,
Take victuals with you for the journey, and
go to meet them, and say unto them, We
are your servants: therefore now make ye a
league with us.
12 This our bread we took hot *for* our pro-
vision out of our houses on the day we came
forth to go unto you; but now, behold, it is
dry, and it is mouldy:
13 And these bottles of wine, which we filled,
were new; and, behold, they be rent: and
these our garments and our shoes are become
old by reason of the very long journey.

15 And Joshua made peace with them,

16 (analysis uncertain)

22 ¶ And Joshua called for them, and he
spake unto them, saying, Wherefore have ye
beguiled us, saying, We *are* very far from
you; when ye dwell among us?
23 Now therefore ye *are* cursed,

TABULAR LIST OF J MATERIAL

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
GENESIS		
		II 4b-8,9*,(15),16-25
		III 1-19,(20),21,(22),23,(24)
		IV 1,2*,3-24,(25,26)
		V 29
		VI 1-6,7*,8
		VII 1,2,3*,4,5,7*,10,12,16b,17b,22*,23*
		VIII 2b,3a,6-12,13b,20-22
		IX 18a,19-21,22*,23-27
		X 8,(9),10-15,(16-18a),18b-23,25*,26-30
		XI 1-9,28-30
XII 1-3,4a,6a,7-20		XII 6b
XIII 1,2,5,7a,8,9,10 (omitting from כי to תצרים),11a,12bβ,13-18		XIII 3,4,7b,10 (entire)
		XV (analysis uncertain, but possibly 1*,2a,3b,4,(7,8),9-11,(12*),17,18*)

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
GENESIS(continued)		
XVI 1,2,4-6,7a,8,11-14		
XVIII 1-16,(20,21),22a,33b		
XIX 1-28		XIX 30-38
XXI 1a,2a,(6b,7),33		
		XXII 20-24
XXIV 1-14,15*,16-58,60-67		XXIV 59
XXV 11b,21-24,25 (without כאדרת שׂער),26a,27,28-34		XXV 1-6
XXVI 1aαb,2a,3abβ,4aαb,6-14,16,17,19-33		
XXVII (analysis uncertain)		
XXVIII 10,13,(14),15,16,19a		
XXIX 2-14,26,31-35		
XXX 9a(b),10-16,20aβ,24,25,27,29-31,32aβ,35(omitting וכל חום בכבשׂים),36,37,38(omitting בשׂקתים המים -- לשׂתות),39b,40aαb,41-43		XXX 1aα,3*,4,5,7,35-43(entire)

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
GENESIS (continued)		
XXXI 1,3,(19a),21-23, 25b,27,31(omitting כי יראתי with the LXX),36a,38-40,44, 46,48,51,52(omitting המצבה where it occurs),(53a)		
XXXII 4-9,14a,(23a, 24a,25*,26b,28,29, 32)		XXXII 24-32(entire)
XXXIII 1-4,6-10,11b-17		
		XXXIV (analysis uncertain)
		XXXV 21,22a
		XXXVI (31-39)
XXXVII (analysis uncertain)		
		XXXVIII
XXXIX 1(omitting פוטיפר סריס פרעה השר הטבחים),2,3,4(4a וישרת אתו ?),5-23		
XL 1aβb,5b,15b		
XLI (analysis uncertain)		
XLII (analysis uncertain)		
XLIII 1-13,15-23a,24-34		

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
Genesis(continued)		
XLIV 1a(b),2-34		
XLV (analysis uncertain)		
XLVI 1aα,28-34abα		
XLVII 1-4,(5a),6b,27a (omitting בארץ מצרים),29-31	XLVII 13-26	
XLVIII 2b,9b,10a,13, 14,17-19,20(only וי״ברכם ביום ההוא)		
		XLIX 1b-27,(28a)
L 1,2b,3*,4-9,10,11, 14		
EXODUS		
I 6,8-10		I (7aβ),20b
II (11-15a),15b-22 (with the omission of Reuel in v. 18 as a gloss),(23aα)		
III 2,3,4a,5,7(as far as נגשיו),8a(as far as מן-הארץ ההיא), (18*)		III 7 and 8 (entire), 16-18 (entire)
IV 19,20a,24-26		IV 1-16,29-31
	V 1,2,5,6,7,9,10, 11a,12-23(with the omission of Aaron where it occurs)	V 3,5-23(entire)
		VI 1

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
EXODUS(continued)		
VII 14,15aα(as far as הכ־מה),16,17a,18 (without the initial ו),21a,25,26-29		
VIII 4,5,6abα,7,8,9-11aαβ,16,17,18a,19 (with the omission of האת),20-28(with references to Aaron in this chapter considered redactional)		
IX 1,2,3aαb,4-7,13, 17,18,23b,24b,25b, 26,(27*),(28), 29abα,(33,34)		
X 1a,3-11,13aβb, 14aβb,15a,16-19,24-26,28,29(with references to Aaron in this chapter considered redactional)		
XI 4-8		
	XII 29-33,38(with references to Aaron in this chapter considered redactional)	XII 21-27,34,37b,39
XIII 21,22		
XIV 5-7(in part), 10abα(as far as ו־ראו תאד),11-14, 19b,20*,21aβγ,24, 25b,27aβγb,(28b),30		XIV 31

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
EXODUS(continued)		
XV 22-25a,27		
	XVI (analysis uncertain)	
	XVII (analysis uncertain)	
	XVIII (analysis uncertain)	
XIX 2aβ		XIX (analysis very uncertain but parts of 3b-9,11b-13,18,20-25)
		XXIV 1,2,9-11
		XXXIII 1,3a,12-23
XXXIV 1a(with the omission of כראשנים),2,4(with the omission of כהראשנים and כאשר צוה יהוה אתו),28 (with the omission of דברי הברית)		XXXIV 1-28(with the omission of frequent redactional additions)
NUMBERS		
X 29-32		
	XI (analysis uncertain)	
		XII 16
XIII (17bα,19,22a,28, 30,31)		
	XIV (analysis uncertain)	

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
NUMBERS(continued)		
XVI (analysis uncertain)		
		XX (1*),3a,5
XXI 1-3		
		XXII and XXIV (analysis uncertain)
		XXV 1b,2,4
	XXXII (analysis uncertain)	
DEUTERONOMY		
	XXXIV 4	
JOSHUA		
	II 6,8,9a,12abα,14, 15abα	
		III (analysis uncertain)
		IV (analysis uncertain)
V 13-15		
		(VI (analysis uncertain))
	VII 21-26(in part)	VII 1-26(in part)
		VIII (analysis uncertain)

Genuine J Material	Probable or Possible but not Unquestionable J Material	Material Regarded as J by Many Critics but not so Considered by the Present Writer
JOSHUA(continued)		
IX 4,5,8,9a,11-13, 15aα,16*,22,23a		IX 6b,7,14*,15aβ,16*
		(X (analysis uncertain))
		(XI (analysis uncertain))
		XIII 13
		XV 13-19,63
		XVI 10
		XVII 11-13,14-18
		XIX 47
JUDGES		
		I 1*,2,3,4*,5-7,10-36
		II 1a,5b

JUSTIFICATION OF THE SELECTION OF J MATERIAL

Genesis I-XI 27

Since the early material of these chapters differs in literary structure, style, mood, and religion from J, and since the method of combination of this material and P varies from the procedure which is evident in the rest of Genesis, it has been concluded that no J is found in these chapters. Compare in this matter Part II, Chapter III.

Genesis XI 28-30

Although J probably begins with the story of Abram, these verses do not constitute the opening of the epic. They do not seem to be independent of P, but either are a part of that document, or an insertion within it, as in the case of the early material of the preceding chapters. They contain a genealogy which is similar to Gen. XXII 20 ff. (a section which is probably not to be attributed to J; see below) and which appears to be presupposed by it. And they speak of Haran as the name of a man, whereas in J it is the name of a place. For these reasons it seems probable that the J document begins with Gen. XII 1, with no further introduction.

Genesis XII

The greater part of this chapter appears to be

JUSTIFICATION OF THE ASSERTION OF A RATIONAL

Sonata I-XII 27

Since the early material of these composers differs in literary structure, style, mood, and relation from J, and since the method of combination of this material and f varies from the procedure which is evident in the rest of Sonata, it has been concluded that no J is found in these chapters. Compare in this matter part II, chapter III.

Sonata XI 29-30

Although J probably begins with the score of 29-a, these verses do not constitute the opening of the coda. They do not seem to be independent of P, but either are a part of that movement, or an interaction which is, as in the case of the early material of the preceding chapters. They contain a procedure which is similar to that. XIII 40 ff. is another which is probably not to be attributed to f: see below) and which appears to be presupposed by it. And this speak of Esther as the name of a man. Moreover in f it is the name of a place. For these reasons it seems probable that the J document begins with them. XII I, will no further identification.

Sonata XII

The greater part of this chapter appears to be

unquestionably J, although the framework of P is found, according to universal opinion, in vv. 4b and 5. 6b also is to be deleted, with Skinner[1] and Gunkel[2], as a gloss interrupting the narrative. A question is sometimes raised concerning vv. 9-20 of the chapter. These verses obviously constitute a doublet to the later story of Isaac and Rebekah in chapter XXVI; and because XIII 2 and 5 seem to Gunkel[3] to form a natural sequel to XII 8 he has suggested that the story of Abram in Egypt has been inserted in the J narrative by another than the original J writer. This Skinner[4] thinks is more probable because of the contrast between the pleasing character of Abram shown in chapters XIII and XVIII and the selfish nature of the patriarch described here. It is doubtful, however, whether that contrast was evident to the people of the author's day, whose ethical ideals in regard to lying to foreigners were not developed. Furthermore vv. 2 and 5 of chapter XIII seem to demand the preceding story of Abram in Egypt as an explanation of the way in which the patriarch's wealth was acquired. It is admitted that XIII 3 and 4 have the appearance of redactional work, since they repeat information given in chapter XII, but if they are omitted from the narrative an

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 246.

2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 150.

3. Ibid., p. 154.

4. Skinner, op. cit., p. 251.

understandable sequence of events results. Abram goes from Egypt into the Negeb and then farther on to Hebron. The intervening trip to Bethel and Ai which is inserted in the present text would make Abram take a strangely roundabout road on his intended journey to Hebron. With regard to the first objection that was raised, although the presence of a similar story in chapter XXVI can not be explained quite satisfactorily, it appears that the author was acquainted with two cycles of tradition-- one around Abram at Hebron, and one around Isaac at Beersheba. Both he desired to include in his epic, and he did so, presenting two similar, but by no means identical narratives. That this would have been possible to a writer of the discernment of J may be shown by a comparison of Mark's account of the Feeding of the Five Thousand and of the Four Thousand. While many critics doubt whether both miracles occurred, all are agreed that Mark, though a writer of genius, presented both incidents in his narrative.

Genesis XIII

The separation of J and P is made according to universal agreement in this chapter. In addition, vv. 3 and 4 are omitted for reasons which are offered in the preceding paragraph, and v. 7b is considered a gloss of a deuteronomistic redactor, as in v. 6b of the preceding chapter. V. 10 offers difficulties because of the description

unmeasurable vagaries of average mortals. Aaron goes from Egypt into the desert and does further on to Hebron. The intervening strip is veiled and at which is inserted in the present text would make Abram take a strangely roundabout road on his intended journey to Hebron. With regard to the first objection that was raised, although the presence of a similar story in chapter XXVI can not be explained quite satisfactorily, it appears that the author was acquainted with two cycles of tradition-- one around Aaron at Hebron, and one around Isaac at Beersheba. Both he desired to include in his epic, and he did so, preserving two similar, but of no means identical narratives. That this would have been possible to a writer of his discernment of J may be seen by a comparison of Barth's account of the feeling of the Five Thousand and of the Four Thousand. Many critics doubt whether both miracles occurred, all are agreed that Mark, through a writer of genius, preserved both incidents in his narrative.

Remark XIII

The separation of J and P is made according to universal agreement in this chapter. In addition, vv. 3 and 4 are omitted for reasons which are offered in the preceding paragraph, and v. 7b is considered a piece of Deuteronomistic redactor, as is v. 6b of the preceding chapter. V. 10 offers difficulties because of the Deuteronomistic

of the locality which is not characteristic of J. The sentence is overloaded and the interpretation difficult, particularly when the juxtaposition of כעצר ים and באכלה צער is considered. If, however, the entire description is removed, including from כי כלה through כארץ מצרים, a simple, easily understood sentence results,-- "and he saw the whole plain of the Jordan as far as Zoar."

Genesis XV

This chapter presents great difficulties. It is obvious that doublets are present, and probably one set of these is to be attributed to E. When the chapter is examined, however, the lateness of all the theological ideas expressed is striking. V. 6, with its emphasis on צדקה, vv. 7 and 8, with the mention of Ur of the Chaldees and the use of the deuteronomic verb ירש, v. 9, with its extreme care to specify the kind of animals sacrificed and their age, vv. 13-16, with their scheme for the number of years the oppression is to continue, and vv. 17-21, which present the conception of a covenant between God and man, the ideal boundaries of the land, and the names of ancient tribes in Canaan which are always to be considered redactional, make it difficult to find any residue which could, with any degree of confidence, be considered J. The chapter is omitted, therefore, in this analysis.

of the locality which is not characteristic of 6. The sentence is overloaded and the interpretation difficult, particularly when the juxtaposition of נרים and נרים is considered. It, however, the entire description is removed, leaving from מלכי to through מלכי ארם, a simple, easily understood sentence results,-- "and he saw the whole plain of the Jordan as far as Zoar."

Genesis XV

This chapter presents great difficulties. It is obvious that doublets are present, and probably one set of these is to be attributed to E. When the chapter is examined, however, the intensee of all the theological ideas expressed is striking. V. 6, with its emphasis on אמן, vv. 7 and 8, with the mention of Ur of the Chaldees and the use of the deuteronomic verb ירש, v. 9, with its sacrifice care to specify the kind of animals sacrificed and their age, vv. 10-16, with their scheme for the number of years the oppression is to continue, and vv. 17-21, which present the conception of a covenant between God and man, the local boundaries of the land, and the names of ancient tribes in Israel which are always to be considered redactional, make it difficult to find any reading which could, with any degree of confidence, be considered J. The chapter is omitted, therefore, in this analysis.

Genesis XVI

1a is usually attributed to P, partly on the ground that אשת אברם resembles the precise style of that source and is repeated in v. 3, and partly because a statement of Sarai's barrenness is lacking otherwise in P. Since P is a mere skeleton framework in most of Genesis this last reason has no weight. The first also has little weight, for there is no reason why this expression should not be used by J, particularly at the beginning of a story to describe Sarai more fully. In fact, if chapter XV is to be omitted a statement like this is demanded in J. V. 7b is questionable before v. 14 and as a close definition of the preceding phrase. It is probably a learned gloss. Vv. 9 and 10 are redactional in preparation for the E story.

Genesis XVIII

Vv. 1-16,20,21 present a charming story of Abraham's hospitality at his home at Hebron and of his reward. They are usually considered J. Within the section, however, are evidences of a double narrative which have brought Eissfeldt[1] to conclude that two sources are intertwined here. The difficulties, however, are rather to be explained by J's use of written sources[2], and none of the verses is to to be rejected from J. Vv. 20 and 21, to be sure, are

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 11, 27*.

2. Cf. Part II, Chapter IV.

Sonnet XVI

It is usually attributed to P, partly on the ground that [illegible] resembles the pseudo style of that sonnet and is repeated in v. 7, but partly because a statement of Sonyl's inconsistency in leaving obscenities in P. Stone I is a more definite (however) in most of Sonnets with last reason but no weight. The first line has little weight, for there is no reason why this accession should not be done by J, particularly as the beginning of a story to describe Sonet more fully. In fact, it chapter XV is to be written a statement like this is unknown in J. V. 7b is obscurationis before v. 14 and is a close imitation of the preceding phrase. It is probably a learned gloss. Vv. 9 and 10 are secretional in proportion for the 8 story.

Sonnets XVIII

Vv. 1-10,00,21 contain a crawling story of Aphrodite's hospitality at all hour of morning and of his sweet. They are usually considered J. Within the section, however, are phrases of a Doubly corrective which have brought [1] [illegible] to conclude that two sources are interwoven here. The difficulty, however, are rather to be explained by the use of written sources, and some of the verses is to be rejected from J. Vv. 10 and 21, to be sure, are

1. Blumenfeld, Sonnenen-Studien, pp. 13, 17.

2. Q2, Part II, Chapter IV.

somewhat questionable because of the bad Hebrew, but they are of assistance to the story and may very probably be authentic. Vv. 17-19, and 22b-33a of this chapter are difficult because they raise the problem of the theodicy and of the value of the individual, which questions are only appreciated in their fulness in the time of Jeremiah and later. The fact also that there is a constant repetition of the same expressions and that this material has no very close connection with the following story makes it seem probable that this is the work of a redactor.

Genesis XIX

Vv. 1-28,30-38 are usually attributed to J. Eissfeldt[1], however, has shown that two stories are intertwined here, as in the preceding chapter. Pfeiffer[2] likewise has shown that characteristics are found here which are not consistent with J. Particularly is this true of vv. 30-38. Probably, as in the preceding chapter, most of the difficulties are to be explained by J's use of written sources. Vv.30-38, however, which are particularly unlike J, are to be excluded from the document as non-essential after v. 28 and a displeasing intrusion. V. 29 is P. For a further discussion of this chapter compare Part II, Chapters III and IV.

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 11, 29*.

2. Pfeiffer, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, in ZAW, 1930, p.66ff.

assumed quadricuneiform because of the [illegible] below, and they are of resistance to the screw and may very probably be [illegible]. Vs. 17-19, are sub-[illegible] of this [illegible] difficult because they raise the problem of the theology and of the value of the individual, which questions are only appreciated in their bearing in the view of Jeremiah and later. The fact also that there is a constant repetition of the same expressions and that this material has so very close connection with the following story makes it seem probable that this is one more or a redactor.

Genesis XIX

Vs. 1-28,30-38 are usually attributed to J. Skinner[1], however, has shown that two stories are intertwined here, as in the preceding chapter. Pfeiffer[2] likewise has shown that characteristics are found here which are not associated with J. Particularly is this case of vs. 30-38. Possibly, as in the preceding chapter, most of the difficulties are to be explained by J's use of written sources. Vs.29, however, which are particularly unlike J, are to be excluded from the document as non-essential after v. 28 and a disjointing insertion. V. 29 is E. For a further discussion of this chapter compare Part II, Chapters III and IV.

1. Skinner, Genesis-Symbols, pp. 13, 29.

2. Pfeiffer, A Non-Jerusalemite Source of the Book of Genesis, in JAOS, 1920, p.[illegible].

Genesis XXI

In this chapter vv. 1a and 2a are generally attributed to J, and 1b and 2b, as doublets of the former, to E. Vv. 6b and 7 likewise are usually attributed to J, but because the etymology of the name Isaac has already been referred to in XVIII 12 we may doubt whether this decision is correct. It has been pointed out by Budde[1] that these verses, if read in the opposite order, constitute a brief poem which might have been introduced here by J from some outside source; yet it seems unlikely that J would have made the first pun on the name of Isaac if he had had at his disposal this poetical fragment of which he intended to make use soon afterward. In the latter part of the chapter(vv. 22-34) two strands can be identified as follows: 22-24,27,31,32b; and 25,26,28-30,32a,33. The first, because of its continuation of chapter XX and the use of אלהים, seems to be E. The second constitutes a difficult problem. It is duplicated in a similar story in the J document in chapter XXVI, and so one would not expect this to be J. In addition, there are no linguistic criteria to suggest that this is J except the presence of יהוה in v. 33. Furthermore the point of this story is to prove ownership of Beersheba, and a desire to prove ownership of land is found in the P document, but is not found elsewhere in J.

1. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, p. 224.

Theorem XXI.

In this chapter vv. 1a and 2a are generally attributed to J, and 1b and 2b, as derivable of the former, to E. vv. 4a and 7 likewise are usually attributed to J, but neither the adjacency of the same Jesus has already been referred to in 4b/11 2f as may doubt whether this decision is correct. It has been pointed out by Budde that these verses, if read in the opposite order, constitute a lateral zone which might have been interpolated from J from some outside source; yet it seems unlikely that J would have made the first one be the cause of leave if he had had at his disposal this omitted fragment of which he intended to make use soon afterward. In the latter part of the chapter(vv. 6-11) the strong redactor identified as follows: 6-8a,9f,9i,10b; and 1b,2c,2d-4a,10a,7. The first. degree of the identification of chapter 6 and the use of הנערים seems to be E. The latter constitutes a difficult problem. It is complicated by a similar among in the T document in chapter XXVI, and in one would not regard this to be J. In addition, there are no interesting patterns to support that this is T except the occurrence of מלאך in v. 7b. Furthermore the point of this story is to prove concerning of Gideon, not a hint to prove concerning of Israel in the 2 occurrence, but is not found elsewhere in J.

1. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, p. 387.

It should be noted likewise that v. 33, which seems to be such good material, appears disconnected from the rest of the chapter, for the subject of ישב is not expressed. It is therefore probable that this verse is a disconnected fragment of J possibly belonging in chapter XXVI, but the rest of the material may belong to E^2. It must be earlier than R^{JE} or else be identical with him because of the redactional references to it in chapter XXVI. V. 34 likewise is redactional.

Genesis XXII 20-24

These verses, which are often attributed to J, are omitted from this analysis because an interest in a genealogy without accompanying stories to make it interesting does not seem characteristic of J.[1] Furthermore it has been suspected that it is only with several alterations that these verses have been made suitable for an introduction to chapter XXIV. The reference to Rebekah in XXII 23a and the phrases in XXIV 15 referring to this verse show evidence of later revision of the text.

Genesis XXIV

This chapter, in its greater part, belongs to J. As has been noted above, however, the hand of a redactor seems to have added in v. 15 the phrase from אשר through

1. Cf. Part II, Chapter V.

It should be noted likewise that v. 20, which seems to be much good material, appears disconnected from the rest of the chapter, for the subject of ‘עמי) is not expressed. It is therefore probable that this verse is a misconstrued fragment of 7 possibly belonging in chapter XXI. But the rest of the material may belong to E^2. It must be earlier than D^{1E} or else be identical with him because of the redactional references to it in chapter XXVI. v. 24 likewise is redactional.

Oracle XXII 20-26

These verses, which are often considered to 1, are omitted from this analysis because so interest in a genealogy without accompanying advice to make it interesting does not seem characteristic of 1. Furthermore it has been contended that it is only with several alterations that these verses have been made suitable for an introduction to chapter XXIV. The reference to Rachab in XXII 26a and the phrase in XXIV 1a referring to this verse show evidence of later revision of the text.

Oracle XXIV

This chapter, in its greater part, belongs to 1. It has been noted above, however, that part of a chapter seems to have added in v. 1b the phrase from ‘אשר בעבדם

1. Cf. Part II, Chapter V.

אברהם. Other sections likewise where the narrative is uneven cause difficulty. The most important of these is found in the double account in vv. 29 and 30 of how Laban ran out to greet Abraham's servant. Is there here evidence of two sources, or can the difficulty be explained in another way? It is to be observed that by a rearrangement of material a smooth text can be obtained. Thus the sequence in the narrative is good if the verses are read as follows: 28,29a,30a,29b,30b. This rearrangement is made in an orderly way, and can be accounted for on the supposition that there was an error in one manuscript such that half of the material had to be written on the margin. When it was later copied, the material in the margin was inserted in the wrong order, with our resulting confused text. This is probably what happened in Judges XVII 2-4, as Professor William R. Arnold has shown in his Ephod and Ark, p. 105. Aside from this section the most troublesome passage in the chapter is that which includes vv. 59-61. It is to be noted that E later refers to Rebekah's nurse in XXXV 8, and so it would not be surprising if v. 59 should be attributed to E, inserted at this point by R^{JE}, who was looking ahead to the later chapter. E, then, probably had some such story as this chapter in his original document, but not as fully told as the narrative of J. It was neglected, therefore, by R^{JE}, with the exception of this one verse, in his compilation of the

[illegible]. Many sections lineales where the manuscript is [illegible] causes difficulty. The most important of these is [illegible] in the Bodleian account in vv. 30 and 40 of Boy Lidman [illegible] to great Arthur's marvel. In Lidman there [illegible] of two arrows, or even the difficulty of explaining in [illegible] way. It is to be observed that by a [illegible] of material a smooth line can be obtained. Thus the [illegible] in the [illegible] is good if the verses are read as follows: 25,26a,30a,31b,32c. This rearrangement is made in an orderly way, and can be accounted for on the supposition that there was an error in one manuscript [illegible] of the material had to be written on the margin. When it was later copied, the material in the margin was inserted in the wrong order, with our resulting [illegible]. This is precisely what happened in Fragment XVII [illegible], as Trautmann William [illegible]. Lewis has shown in his [illegible], p. 128. Aside from this [illegible] the [illegible] passage in the copyist is that which includes vv. 23-27. It is to be noted that a later writer to [illegible] in XXIV 6, and so it would not be surprising if v. 30 should be accommodated to 6, [illegible] at this point by [illegible], who was looking ahead to the Lidman chapter. 6, [illegible] probably had some such story as this chapter in his original document, but not as fully told as the [illegible] of 7. It was simplified, therefore, by [illegible], with the exception of this one verse, in the [illegible] of the

narrative, in favor of the more beautiful story of J.

Genesis XXV

The first six verses of this chapter are often attributed to J. Because they constitute a genealogy without accompanying illustrative material, they, like chapter XXII 20-24, which has been discussed above, are not included in this analysis. The verses of this chapter which have been attributed to J in the above analysis do not include v. 18, which either as a whole or in part is often considered to belong to that source. Many commentators assign the verse to J because it offers a different location for the Ishmaelites than does the P narrative. Its phraseology and the fact that it breaks the connection in the simple narrative of XXIV 67, XXV 11b,21 make it seem more probable that this verse is redactional work. The verses which are listed above as belonging to J have been so considered because of the characteristic J phrases such as אתה זה, יהוה, אל. The doublet in v. 25, however, makes it probable that E is also present; and since both J and E contain a good deal of material concerning Jacob and Esau it might be assumed that the story of their birth would be included in both documents. It is questionable how much of E has been preserved in this section, but because of the play on Seir in parts of chapter XXVII which are to be attributed to E, and because of the hostility to Edom which is continually shown by the J writer, who comes from Judah, the neighbor

narrative, in favor of the more orthodoxical story of J.

Genesis XXV

The first six verses of this chapter are often attributed to J. because they contribute a genealogy without accompanying illustrative material. Only, like chapter XXII 20-24, which has been discussed above, are not included in this analysis. The verses of this chapter which have been attributed to J in the above analysis do not include v. 16, which either as a whole or in part is often considered to belong to that source. Many commentators assign the verse to J because it offers a different location for the Ishmaelites than does the P narrative. The phraseology and the fact that it breaks the connection in the simple narrative of XXIV 67, XXV 11b,12 make it seem more probable that this verse is redactional work. The verses which are listed above as belonging to J have been so constructed because of the characteristic J phrases such as "it not, pray, so." The doublet in v. 23, however, makes it probable that E is also present; and since both J and E contain a good deal of material concerning Jacob and Esau it might be asserted that the story of their birth would be included in both documents. It is questionable how much of E has been preserved in this section, but because of the play on words in parts of chapter XXVII which are to be attributed to E, and because of the possibility to Esau which is continually shown by the J writer, who comes from Judah, the neighbor

of Edom, it is probable that only the phrase כאדרת שער in v. 25 was retained by R^{JE} from E when he combined the two sources in the narrative of chapter XXV.

Genesis XXVI

The work of R^{JE} evidently is present in vv. 1,2,15, and 18, which contain his attempts to harmonize this material with some of the preceding Genesis narratives. V. 5 is also evidently late,-- post-exilic; and a part of vv. 3 and 4 sounds suspicious. Concerning the latter, however, it must be remembered that so much of J's message is based on the promises that care must be taken not to eliminate too much as redactional elaboration. Objections, however, are sometimes offered to the assignment of any of the material in this chapter to J. Parallels are found in Gen. XII 10-20, and part of XXI 22-34 to all of the material in this chapter. In so far as Gen. XXI 22-34 is concerned, since it has been decided that none of this material, with the exception of v. 33, belongs to the J source, these verses can raise no difficulty to the attribution of Gen. XXVI to J. Gen. XII 10-20, however, offers a more serious problem. It is to be noted, nevertheless, that both sections are old, and that they concern different individuals. Apparently, as has been noted above, two cycles of legends (possibly written) were available to the authors of the sources, one around Abraham and Hebron, and one around

Isaac and Beersheba. Both were known and used by J, the former in chapter XII, and the latter in the chapter with which we are at present concerned. It is admitted that the chapter seems out of place in the J narrative. Possibly it belongs before v. 21 of Chapter XXV.

Genesis XXVII

V. 46 of the present chapter is universally considered to be P. Aside from this verse the material is to be attributed to a combination of J and E; the redactor who was responsible for the combination, however, worked so skilfully that in the case of many verses it is impossible to determine the source from which the material originates. That two sources are present, however, is to be seen in the fact that two tests are described which Isaac is said to have applied in his attempt to discover whether he was being deceived or not. That they are not two successive tests used by him is shown by the verses preceding and following each test, which state that each is the beginning of Isaac's attempt to assure himself that he is not the victim of fraud. A beginning of an analysis may be made at v. 27 because of the word יהוה which is found therein. With that as a basis vv. 15,24-27 may be attributed to J, whereas vv. 11-13,16,18,19,21-23,28 may be assigned to E. It is to be noted that this analysis gives a basis for judging that in chapter XXV the emphasis

on Esau as a hairy man is E, for here E makes Esau's hairy skin of great importance to the story. In the latter part of the chapter vv. 32-34 seem to be parallel to 35-38. It is to be noted here that 35-38 give a second derivation of the name Jacob, probably signifying that these verses are from a different source than XXV 26a. The latter has already been assigned to J, and it therefore becomes possible to assign XXVII 35-38 to E. Vv. 32-34 must then be considered J. V. 39, because of its relation to 28, is probably E. V. 29 appears to be composite. 29b, because of its similarity to XII 3, may be J; and 29a contains doublets. Of these the second resembles v. 37, which, it has just been suggested, is from E. Then 29aα must be J. V. 30, likewise, contains doublets, but the source to which each belongs is doubtful. To E may also be attributed v. 1b because of the term לבן, and to J v. 43 because of the mention of Haran. The verses, therefore, which appear most probably to belong to J are: 7,15,20,24-27,29aαβ,b,30*,32-34,43. Those which can with some probability be assigned to E are: 1b,11-13,16,18,19,21-23,28,29aγδ,30*,35-38,39. The verses which are wholly uncertain, then, are: 1a,2-6,8-10,14,17,30*, 31,40-42,44,45.[1] There is one difficulty which the preceding analysis raises. It appears that v. 36 refers to chapter XXV 29-34. Should the latter, contrary to our previous

1. The preceding analysis is made largely on the basis of Gunkel's Genesis.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

decision, be attributed to E? Or, on the other hand, is the mention of the birthright in XXVII 36 inserted there by R^{JE}?

Genesis XXVIII

The analysis of this chapter agrees with that of the majority of critics. The section does not seem quite complete, and it has probably been shortened in favor of the more graphic picture of E. It is possible, likewise, that v. 14 may be redactional, yet this verse is a repetition of the promises, which are very characteristic of J, and which should be deleted only after careful consideration.

Genesis XXIX

There are several considerations in the first thirty verses of the chapter which show that the narrative is composite. First to be noted is the variation in the name of the country to which Jacob goes. V. 1 is usually attributed to E, because it speaks of the "land of the children of the east", and the following verses which mention Haran are given to J. The next very noticeable confusion in the narrative appears in v. 16, which introduces Rachel as though she had not been mentioned previously. For this reason it is supposed that a new document (E) begins with v. 15. Eissfeldt[1] feels that the same is to be said

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 22.

of v. 10 following v.6. Against this it may be said that the author has phrased his narrative as it stands in our text from a desire to focus attention on Rachel, and also to bind his story together well. Furthermore, as Holzinger[1] has noted, there is probably at this point a touch of humor in a presentation of Jacob's attempt to arrange a meeting alone with the girl. V. 26 has been assigned to J, as is usually agreed, because of the presence of הצעירה, a characteristic word of J. It is noticeable that the following chapter demands an account of the marriage in both sources, yet v. 25, which seems to be E, expects an answer, and it is impossible to help wondering why the redactor should have shifted to J for this one verse. Vv. 24 and 29, as is generally recognized, are from the hand of P; and vv. 31-35 are unified and belong to J.

Genesis XXX

The whole chapter is difficult, and much from each source seems to have been omitted in the compilation. In addition to the verses listed above, Gunkel[2] considers 1a J because of the similarity of sentence structure to XXIX 31 and XXX 9a. 3aβ and bβ are also assigned to J sometimes by commentators because of resemblances to XVI 2.

1. Holzinger, Genesis, p. 194; cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 294.
2. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 298.

Vv. 4 and 5, together with v. 7, are associated with this because of the sequence of the story. The presence of אלהים, however, in vv. 2 and 6 indicates that E is present in the section, and it is probable that the redactor used that document for vv. 1-8 (with the possible exception that P may be present in parts of 4 and 7; compare the presence of שׁפחה), and that J was not used again until v. 9a. 9b, like v.7, may belong to P because of the use of שׁפחה and לאשה, yet it is necessary for the sequence of the J narrative. V. 13 gives two etymologies for the name Asher. Is one J and one E? V. 21 looks forward to chapter XXXIV, and, if J were present in that chapter, might belong to the Yahwistic source. It is more likely, however, to be the work of a redactor. V. 26 is a doublet of vv. 25 and 29, and v. 28 a doublet of v. 31; therefore it is probable that vv. 26 and 28 are to be attributed to the E document. In confirmation of this decision is the fact that both vv. 27 and 28 begin with ויאמר with no change of subject. The division of vv. 32-36 is quite complicated, but on the basis of Wellhausen's Composition (pp. 39-42) a certain amount of agreement seems to have been reached. The foundation of the narrative is J, which is found in v. 31 and again in vv. 35 and 36. According to this section Jacob receives for the present no wages, but goes on tending the sheep of one color, while Laban gives the variegated sheep into

the care of his sons. The agreement for the future seems to have been omitted by the redactor in favor of the material from E which now intrudes, but it is possible to deduce from the following sequence of events that the wages of Jacob were to consist in the variegated sheep which were born of this plain herd. According to E a definite hire was decided upon-- that the brown among the sheep and the motley goats should belong to Jacob. V. 32, then, belongs in large part to E, but the difficult grammatical construction of the verb הסר, preceded by another verb in the same sentence, shows that, beginning with this imperative, a clause must have been introduced from J (הסר תשם כל-שה נקד וטלוא). Vv. 33 and 34 continue the section from E, and because of the superfluity of clauses in v. 35 and the resemblance of וכל-חום בכבשים to a part of v. 32 this phrase is attributed to E. In vv. 37-43 redundant expressions also give evidence of compilation of material. The phrases which need to be omitted here, however, are mere fragments which give no indication that an independent narrative ever existed, and because they are quite at variance with the E material of the following chapter it is more satisfactory to attribute them to a diligent glossator than to account for them as a part of some strand of E. For the phrases referred to see the list above and the commentary of Gunkel.

Genesis XXXI

In this chapter vv. 1 and 2 are doublets. Since v. 2 and v. 5 belong together and v. 5 is obviously to be attributed to E we may assign v. 1 to J. V. 3 also is a part of J because of the presence of יהוה therein. Vv. 4-16 constitute a straightforward E narrative. Vv. 21 and 17 are parallels, and because of the mention of the Euphrates vv. 21-23 are attributed to J. For no particular reason the first half of v. 19 is often assigned to J. The last half of that verse, because of its connection with the material in the rest of the chapter which is assigned to E, is likewise to be attributed to that document. V. 27 is a doublet of v. 26 and finds its natural sequence in v. 31. This latter verse seems likewise to break the connection in the E narrative in which it is now found, so it is probable that both verses are to be attributed to J. In v. 31, however, the phrase כי יראתי is poor style immediately before the כי אמרתי following it, and the LXX omits it; it is therefore probably to be considered a gloss. Vv. 32-35 give the story of the teraphim from the E document. V. 36 is composed of a pair of doublets, the first of which may be assigned to J, and the second to E. V. 37 forms the continuation of the story of the teraphim, and thus belongs to E rather than to J. Vv. 38-40 are parallel to 41 ff. and

Sonnets XXII

In this sonnet vv. 1 and 3 are lacunaire. Since v. 4 and v. 5 begin consecutive and v. 5 is obviously to be attributed to Q on any assign v. 1 to Q. V. 10 also is a part of 1 measure of bad [illegible] of this [illegible]. Vv. 9-10 constitute a dialogic[illegible] & narrative. Vv. 11 and 12 are monistic, and because of the omission of the [illegible] vv. 11-12 are attributed to Q. The so-[illegible] leaves the latter half of v. 11 to stand assigned to Q. The last half of that verse, because of the [illegible] this line appears in the [illegible] of the [illegible] assigned to Q, is likewise to be attributed to that speaker. V. 12 is a [illegible] of v. 10 and [illegible] sequence in v. 11. This [illegible] verse [illegible] to break the connection in the 2 quartets is which it is now found, as it is probable that both [illegible] are to be attributed to Q. In v. 11, however, the phrase "[illegible]" is more apt immediately before the "[illegible]" following it, and the [illegible] write it; it is therefore probably to be considered a gloss. Vv. 13-14 give the [illegible] of the [illegible] from the 2 [illegible]. V. 13 is composed of a [illegible] of [illegible], but [illegible] of [illegible] may be assigned to Q, and the second to Q. V. 14 [illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] of the [illegible], and thus [illegible] to Q rather than to Q. Vv. 13-14 are [illegible] to Q [illegible].

furthermore describe the shepherd life as J is fond of doing, so it is probable that they are to be attributed to that source. From v. 44 to the end of the chapter two stories seem to be woven together, one describing an agreement concerning the border between the two peoples, arranged by a heap at Gilead, and the other describing a family arrangement which is ratified by a mazzebah at Mizpah. V. 44, because of the use of ty, and v. 46, because of the heap of stones, are to be attributed to J; while v. 45, because of its mention of the mazzebah, is E. It appears that v. 47 must be a redactional addition because it contains a phrase in Aramaic, which is not found elsewhere in the documents. V. 48 is a continuation of 46, while v. 49 is rather to be attributed to E because it presents the derivation of Mizpah. To that source belongs v. 50 also, because it describes the family agreement. Vv. 51 and 52 seem to be essentially J, with phrases inserted by R^{JE} from E. V. 53 is questionable; are a and b doublets, and thus a a part of J? V. 54 repeats a part of 46, and so is to be attributed to E. This analysis is based upon the work of Skinner[1] and Gunkel[2] and varies widely from that of other critics. In many cases the judgment turns on fine points, but to the present writer it appears to be substantially correct.

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 393 ff.

2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 310 ff.

[illegible] Lagrange has compared life as it is found of [illegible] to it is probable that they are to be attributed to [illegible] source. Item 7. As to the use of the chapter two [illegible] [illegible] [illegible], one [illegible] an [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Genesis XXXII

Vv. 1-3 of this chapter, because of the use of אלהים, are surely to be attributed to E. In the rest of the chapter doublets indicate that both J and E are present. In vv. 4-22 two big sections of material succeed each other, as is suggested by the doublets in 14a and 22. The phrases in 4-14a, such as יהוה, and מצא חן, indicate that the J document is found here, while vv. 14b-22, as the parallel to that section, are to be attributed to E. The commentators suspect, however, that in the J section work of a redactor may be distinguished, for the prayer in vv. 10-13 is very profuse, and contains such expressions as מכל החסדים ומכל-האמת which are not common in J. In vv. 23 and 24 the passage of the brook seems to be described twice, suggesting that the preceding two strands are continued closely intermingled. Skinner[1] and Gunkel[2] divide the sections among the sources as follows: 23a,24a=J; 23b,24b=E. Vv. 25-33 are often attributed as a whole to J. The fact that the laming of Jacob's thigh is told twice, as well as the repeated question concerning the opponent's name and the variation in the spelling of the name Penuel (in v. 31 Peniel), has brought Skinner and Gunkel again to the conviction that here also two

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 407 ff.

2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 325 ff.

Remarks (cont)

vv. 1-2 of this section, concerning of the use of [illegible], and turning to by exclaimed to [illegible]. In the work of the composer Tanchum Yerushalmi [illegible] and [illegible] answered. In vv. 6-22 two big emotions of [illegible] grief [illegible], as suggested by the numbers in the end [illegible]. The [illegible] in [illegible], such as [illegible], indicate that the 3 decreased in [illegible], while vv. 18-22, as far [illegible] to that section, are to be attributed to [illegible]. The [illegible] suggest, however, that in the 3 section [illegible] of a [illegible] may be identified, for the prayer in vv. 10-18 is very [illegible], and omitting such [illegible] [illegible] which are not present in [illegible]. In vv. 20 and 24 the phrase of the [illegible] seems to be described below, suggesting that the preceding two [illegible] are continuous [illegible]. Scholar and [illegible][1] [illegible][2] [illegible] among the [illegible] as follows:

[illegible]: [illegible]. Vv. 6-20 are [illegible] as a whole [illegible]. [illegible] [illegible] of [illegible] is [illegible]. As well as the [illegible] concerning the [illegible] and the [illegible] in the [illegible] of the [illegible] (in v. 21 [illegible]), the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] to the [illegible] [illegible]

1. Schanen, [illegible], p. 107 ff.
2. Gordon, [illegible], p. 168 ff.

sources are present. The division as they have worked it out is as follows: J=26b,28,29,32; E=26a,27,30,31. V. 33 is not J, but it is questionable whether it is to be considered E or the work of a redactor. The basis for attributing the first of these divisions to J is the fact that in the later narrative J prefers the name Israel while E prefers Jacob, and therefore it would seem most natural to assume that it would be the J document which would tell of the origin of the name Israel, as in v. 29. Furthermore, in v. 31 the word אלהים suggests that E is responsible for this material.

Genesis XXXIII

The greater part of vv. 1-17 is unquestionably J material, as the phrases שפחה, יירן לקראתו, עבדך, מצא חן, and לתה זה give evidence. It is probable, however, that a similar story was contained in the E document, and that a few sections from that narrative have been inserted by the redactor into material predominantly J. Evidence for this is the presence of אלהים in vv. 5 and 11. Of these v. 5 is a doublet of v. 6 and unnecessary in the narrative. V. 11a also appears to be an elaboration of the preceding verse, and is little missed if it is removed from the chapter. This is not true of v. 11b, however, and that portion of the verse is probably to be retained as a part of J. אלהים is

also found in v. 10, but there it is not used in the sense of יהוה, but rather with the meaning deity, and it is therefore quite admissible as a part of the J document.

Genesis XXXIV

At least two strands of material are interwoven in this chapter, one very early, and one consisting of later material. They are usually attributed to J and E respectively, although some of the late material is so similar to P's work that many believe a priestly revision has been made. Because this chapter intrudes in the sequence of the narrative at this point, because of the relations which are described between the patriarchs and the people of the land, because of the mood of the story, and its interest in circumcision, it is doubtful whether any of it belongs to J.[1] More probable is the view that this formed a part of the early edition of stories used by J, but was rejected by him, and only inserted in the Pentateuch by a post-exilic writer. Compare Part II, Chapters III and IV.

Genesis XXXV

The brief fragment which remains in vv. 21 and 22a is quite universally assigned to J because of the use of

1. Cf. Professor Pfeiffer's rejection of this from J in A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, ZAW, 1930, p. 66 ff.

also found in v. 10, but there it is not used in the sense of part, but rather also the meaning *delay*, and it is sometimes quite difficult to a part of the T itself.

Genesis 22:17

As Isaac has already of material are interwoven in this chapter, one very early, and one consisting of later material. Just are usually attributed to J and P respectively. Although some of the late material is so similar to J's work that we cannot believe a satisfactory revision has been made. Because this chapter intervenes in the sequence of the narrative at this point, consider of the relations which are discovered between the patriarchs and the people of the land, priests of the moon of the story, and its intended in allegorization. It is noteworthy [illegible] any of it belongs to J. Some genealogy is the only that this formed a part of the early building of Genesis upon J, but the [illegible] of sin, and only insertion in the [illegible] by a post-exilic editor. Compare part II, Chapters 1:1 and 19.

Genesis 22:20

The point fragment which commence in 20. It was [illegible] is quite noticeably assigned to J because of the use of

1. Cf. Professor Friedlaender's revision of this from J in *A Non-Priestly Origin of the Book of Genesis*, [illegible], 1908, p. 20 f.

the name Israel, which J prefers, instead of Jacob, as is found in the preceding and following verses. Here too, in so far as it is possible to judge from so small a remnant of what must once have been a much longer story, appears the harsh mood of parts of the Urgeschichte which feels no hesitation in telling unpalatable tales about the patriarchs. This mood stands in sharp contrast to the pride in the first men of the nation expressed by most of the J narrative, and constitutes a strong argument in support of Professor Pfeiffer[1]'s decision that such material is not the work of the J writer. That this, with the preceding chapter, formed part of J's sources, but was rejected by him from his epic will be maintained in Part II, Chapters III and IV.

Genesis XXXVI 31-39

Occasionally these verses, which concern the rulers of Edom, are attributed to J because they seem to be derived from an early and trustworthy source. This assignment, however, is unconvincing. J has given no genealogies without accompanying stories to make them interesting.[2] He is not interested in people outside of Israel, except as they have relations with Israel. The list is found

1. Pfeiffer, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, ZAW, 1930, p. 66 ff.

2. Cf. Part II, Chapter V.

attached to the P document, but no place within J can be found suited to its use. With J's great narrative ability, would he not have provided a satisfactory setting for this section, making it appear indigenous to the narrative, if he had desired to include it in his epic?

Genesis XXXVII

The chapter is so well constructed that any confident separation of sources can not be made in most of the verses. Vv. 1 and 2, however, are surely the work of P because of the presence of the expression ארץ כנען and the interest in the numbers. In v. 3 appears the name Israel and the theme of the jealousy which arises because of the gift of the coat to Joseph. This is J. Vv. 5-11 are usually assigned to E because of the emphasis on dreams and on the hegemony of Joseph. It has been noted by Eissfeldt[1], however, that since E has already told of the mother's death (XXXV 19), v. 10 and the other verses associated with it must belong to J, according to whom the mother is still living. Vv. 12-17 are difficult. In the E narrative of chapter XXXIII and the first part of XXXV Jacob was staying at Shechem, but after that he went to Bethel and Ephrath. Never in J has it been said that he was in Shechem (note that chapter XXXIV is not considered J); and in neither J nor E has he been

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 266*.

associated with Hebron previously, but only in P. A beginning of an analysis of this section, however, may be made in v. 13, where in a is found the word Israel, and in b הנני. 13a, therefore, is J and 13b E. With 13a apparently is associated v. 12, and 14a, because of וישלחך, which would be unnecessary after 13a, seems to go with 13b. V. 14b, however, as the continuation of 13a, is probably to be attributed to J. Vv. 15-17 are very uncertain. Gunkel[1] would assign them to E because of his theory that in that document Jacob was conceived as living in Shechem, from where he sent Joseph to a field near by his home to find his brothers. When Joseph got there, however, he found that his brothers had strayed farther away, so that he was obliged to go some distance to find them. In Dothan, then, which was far from his home, it was easier for the brothers to injure him. According to J, however, Gunkel thinks, Jacob was living in Hebron and the journey to Shechem in itself was a long one and took Joseph far enough from home so that he could be injured without having the deed known. Thus in J Dothan was not mentioned. This distinction between the J and E narratives which Gunkel has supposed exists is by no means clear from the text as we find it today, but it is quite possible that in his ingenious reconstruction Gunkel is right in the matter. Vv. 18-30 contain doublets which are in places easily discerned.

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 364.

In one story the brothers desire to kill Joseph, but Judah saves his life by suggesting that he be sold to a band of Ishmaelites instead. In the other the brothers also want to slay him and put his body in a pit, but Reuben makes the suggestion that they cast him alive into a pit in the hope that at a later time he will be able to return and save his brother from the hand of the others. While the boy is in the pit, however, Midianites kidnap him and take him to Egypt. By observing these distinctions it is possible to divide the text as follows: to J is to be attributed 18 (in full or in part), 21 (with Reuben changed to Judah), 23,25-27,28aγ,(b? This clause is usually assigned to E because of the use of וירבאו rather than the verb ירד as in v. 25, and because of the presence of this verb in chapter XXXIX 1. This does not seem to be a conclusive reason, but the matter is not important, for a similar clause must have stood in both sources.). The division in vv. 31-35 is quite doubtful. 33aβ because of its resemblance to v. 20 seems to be E. V. 32, with the confusion of וישלחו and וירבאו, is probably compound. Does 32aαγb belong to J, whereas 32aβ belongs to E? 31 is uncertain. Is 33aαb J? Gunkel divides vv. 34 and 35 thus: 34a,35b=E; 34b,35a=J. The presence of the name Jacob in v. 34a gives one clue for this division. V. 36, because of the mention of the Midianites,belongs to E.

Genesis XXXVIII

This chapter is generally attributed to J because of its knowledge of traditions about Judah, and because of the use of יהוה, כי-על-כן, and לבלתי therein. Professor Pfeiffer[1], however, has presented grounds for denying the correctness of this decision. Since it interrupts the Joseph story of J, presents Judah as living among the people of the land, is harsh in mood, admits the presence of sacred prostitution, and tells a displeasing story of Judah, it is clear that it does not form a part of J. It rather formed a part of J's sources, but was rejected by him, as will be made clear in Part II, Chapters III and IV.

Genesis XXXIX

Most of the chapter is unquestionably J because the narrative is very different from that of E, who knows of no imprisonment, and who considers Joseph to have been a servant of a eunuch and a worker in the prison which was under the eunuch's charge. There are some places in the chapter, however, where the narrative is uneven. In v. 1 the redactor has evidently added from chapter XXXVII 36 (E) a more detailed explanation of who Joseph's master was. In v. 4 the phrase וישרת אתו, which Gunkel[2] considers an

1. Pfeiffer, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, ZAW, 1930, p. 66 ff.

2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 380.

Thematic Conflict

This analysis is primarily restricted to I because of its adaptation of twentieth-century Jewish, and because of the use of pun[1], [illegible], and [illegible] complexity. Protagonist Difficult, however, has prominent grounds for keeping the consideration of data constant. Since it incorporates the larger story of I, Pamuncia Lucas as living among the people of the land, is seen in mood, despite the presence of several possibilities, and tells a displeasing story of [illegible]. It is clear that it does not form a part of I. It rather issued a part of its sources, and was rejected by him. We will be back later in Part II, Chapters III and IV.

Thematic Focus

Most of the chapter is concerned-mainly I assumes the narration is very different from that of E, who knows of no legislation, and who emphasizes Joseph in more a survival of a smaller and a weaker in the nations which are under the wonder's shadow. There are some clauses in the narrative, however, where his narrative is unknown. In V. 3 the narrator has [illegible] about Jew-chapter [illegible] a more definite [illegible] of the Israelite's [illegible] to V. 4 the phrase [illegible][2], which [illegible] an

1. [illegible], A Non-[illegible] Source of the Book of Deuteronomy, [illegible], [illegible].

2. [illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

intrusion, and which describes Joseph's status according to the conception of E, may also be a fragment drawn in from a lost section of E. 6b is sometimes thought to be E, but as it stands it fills an important place in the sequence of the story, and with Gunkel is probably to be considered authentic. V. 9 also causes some trouble because of the use of אלהים in the mouth of Joseph; yet it is to be expected that he would make use of this term, since he is here speaking to an Egyptian.

Genesis XL

In this chapter the prominence of the story of Joseph as servant of the captain of the guard shows that E predominates; yet fragments are left of a J story which must have been similar, since according to J Joseph is later taken from prison to interpret dreams. Note 1aβb, which is a doublet of 2. 3b seems more like redactional harmonizing than like a part of an independent document. 5b is probably to be attributed to J because of the use of the same expressions to describe the butler and baker as are found in v. 1, and likewise because of בבית הסהר, as in the preceding chapter. V. 15b also is obviously from the J narrative because of the supposition that Joseph was imprisoned.

Genesis XLI

In the first 27 verses of this chapter the narrative is unified and from E (cf. vv. 9-13), with the single exception of v. 14, which may contain a phrase concerning Joseph's imprisonment introduced by the redactor from a parallel narrative of J. In the rest of the chapter there are great difficulties. That it is composite appears plainly from the very great fulness of detail, and from such doublets as the appointing of a single man to be over the land of Egypt on the one hand, while in the next verse it says that a number of officers are to be appointed. Also in one section it is said that a fifth part of the corn is to be stored, while in the next verse it says that all the food is to be stored. At times the storing of the food is to be under royal authority, at others it is to be retained in the cities near which it was produced. Furthermore the mention of Potipherah, priest of On can hardly be attributed to E, since the E narrator has used that name earlier for the eunuch, Joseph's master. V. 46a appears to be P. Vv. 50-52, concerning the birth of Joseph's sons, seem to interrupt the narrative, and it is doubtful, as Skinner says,[1] whether they belong to either source, or whether they are not rather a later addition. Beyond what has just been said to show that the story was present in two versions at least, and that, from analogy with previous chapters,

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 471.

Insoluble Kit

In the final of games at both nominer the narrative is quicked and fund a lot. 5v. 4-13). with the single exception of v. 16, which may contain a curious commentary Joseph's importance introduced by the redactor from a political perspective of 7. In the way of the wheater there are great difficulties. That it is necessitar assumes objects from the very great labors of details, one true such questions as the exposition of a single man to a over the land of Egypt on the one hand, while on the dual views is edge such a number of officers are to be appointed. Also in one question it is said that a little part of the grain is to be stored, while in the very verse it says that all the food is to be stored. It allows the objections of the land to be unsure equal authority, or stores it is to be the principal in the writer more which it was produced. Furthermore the mention of footpowers, which of on one hand is attributed to 6, since the a warrior has hand use, most cultivate for the country, Joseph's master. 7. The governor is in 7. 17. 18-19, concerning the crime of Joseph's some, some as indicated his narrative, and it is uncertain. as Ishmaelites, whether that belong to either people, or neither-they are not raised a later addition. Having what has just been said we know that the story was re-worked in two versions it lived, and that. from another with previous chapters,

1. Ryssel, Genesis, c. 47:.

the probability is that one version is to be attributed to J and one to E it can hardly be gone. It is not even possible to be certain whether E or J was the document which gave the advice that one man instead of several be appointed over the land.[1] Eissfeldt considers it to have been J,[2] while Gunkel and Skinner[3] believe it to have been E. So, recognizing that both sources are present in this chapter, it seems better not to express an opinion concerning their separation.

Genesis XLII

This chapter likewise is full of difficulties. E was apparently used as a basis, but doublets and inconsistencies are very obvious. Vv. 1a and 1b appear to be doublets because of the repetition of יעקב after two successive verbs. V. 2 again has a repetition of ויאמר, and for that reason it is usually attributed to J, while the preceding verse is considered a unit and assigned to E on account of the name Jacob.[4] Eissfeldt, however, makes the division 1a,2=J, 1b=E, considering Jacob in 1a redactional. V. 4b may be located because it contains an expression which is repeated in 38, a verse universally

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 84*.
2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 392.
3. Skinner, Genesis, p. 468.
4. Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 19, 86*, 267*.

considered J. V. 5 contains the name Israel, as one expects in J, and is parallel to 6b, which is therefore E. It is to be noted that in v. 5 the expression "land of Canaan", usually a sign of P, appears, and that in its continuation 6a הַשָּׂדֶה a very late word occurs. Can 5 and 6a be from P? It is noticeable that the phrase "land of Canaan" occurs frequently in the next few chapters, and it has made some critics wonder whether there has been a P recension here. Possibly, however, the correct explanation is rather that there is such a contrast here between the land of Egypt and the land of Canaan that this was the natural expression for any writer to use. Doublets appear in vv. 7a and 8, the latter of which is often said to be J, and in 11a and 13, of which the former is usually assigned to J. Since v. 11 is repeated in v. 31, and the latter is part of a section including vv. 29-37 which is usually said to be unified and to belong to E, the correctness of this analysis may be questioned. Vv. 15-24 are very difficult. Chapter XLIII makes the statement that the brothers were allowed to go home with the command that they should not return without Benjamin. This story comes from J. In the E narrative found in the latter part of chapter XLII, however, Simeon was left in prison while the others went home to get Benjamin and bring him back with them. To what source, then, does the account in v. 16 belong according to which Joseph makes up his mind to put all in prison except one

and send that one for the youngest brother? Vv. 27 and 28a seem to be J because they are doublets of v. 35 and agree well with the account in chapter XLIII. V. 38 is probably a part of J, although it is out of place in the present narrative and should rather stand after chapter XLIII 2, where it seems probable that other material once was found which at present has been lost.[1]

Genesis XLIII

This chapter is to be attributed almost entirely to the J document, as is shown by the prominence of Judah, in contrast to Reuben of the preceding E narrative, by the use of the name Israel, and by the use of תשפוא instead of E's תזון. It is to be noted also that it is probable that a change of document has taken place because in chapter XLII the need of returning to Egypt at once was imperative, while in this chapter a long time has elapsed between the arrival at their home and the decision that a return to Egypt must be made in order to procure still more food for their families. In vv. 14 and 23b, however, the reference to Simeon's imprisonment gives evidence that another than the J writer has been at work in the chapter. In the story of Joseph's decision to put Simeon in prison it was emphasized that the brothers must return to Egypt immediately, a conception which is not in harmony, as has

1. Cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. 479.f.

been mentioned above, with J's view that a long time elapsed between the two visits. That these verses are from the hand of a redactor who was familiar with the preceding E narrative is shown further by the use of the name El Shaddai for the deity, a term which is not employed by either E or J.

Genesis XLIV

In this chapter is found a narrative which is to be attributed entirely to J, as is shown by the continued prominence of Judah, and by the fact that here and in XLIII emphasis is laid on the stipulation that the brothers should return only if Benjamin were with them, while in chapter XLII they were forced to return any way by the detention of Simeon in prison. It is possible that in 1b a gloss is present, as Gunkel[1] has suggested, for while in the preceding narrative the presence of the money in the mouth of the sacks served its purpose in the development of the story, it is not referred to again after this verse, and appears to be an unnecessary detail at this point.

Genesis XLV

Both sources are present in this chapter, but apparently the redactor worked with E as a basis, introducing sections from J. It is therefore very difficult to separate the sections, and no confidence can be felt in any detailed

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 409.

results. It is possible that a part of v. 1 belongs to J because of the care which Joseph takes to keep the knowledge of the arrival of his brothers from Pharaoh until a later time, in contrast to E, who describes the interest with which Pharaoh makes provision for the safety and comfort of Joseph's family. Vv. 4 and 5a are certainly to be attributed to J because of the reference to the fact that Joseph was sold into Egypt. They also are parallel to v. 3, E. Vv. 5b-9 contain the word אלהים frequently, and so are probably a part of the E document, although the fulness of expression in some of the verses, as v. 7, for example, persuades Gunkel[1] that occasional fragments from J are present. V. 10aα,b is from J because of the mention of Goshen, but 10aβ appears to be E because of the assurance that they shall all be near Joseph. V. 11b is probably from J because they are to have all their possessions with them. V. 13 is J because it is parallel to 9. 14 likewise is probably to be considered J, and it is parallel to 15. The rest of the chapter is still more doubtful because of the presence of such phrases as land of Canaan and children of Israel, which are characteristic of P. Vv. 16-18 seem to be E. V. 19 is textually difficult and seems to break the connection, as also v. 21. Gunkel assigns them to J, with the exception of ואתה צויתי in

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 414 ff.

v. 19, and על פי פרעה in 21, which he considers harmonizing phrases of a redactor. With 19 and 21 he also associates part of v. 27 and 28. Of the latter we can be sure because of the use of Israel. The other verses are less certain, but they may come from J and be designed to show Joseph's provision for his father, of which Pharaoh had as yet no knowledge, contrary to the opinion of E.

Genesis XLVI

In most of the chapter the work of P and E (note אלהים, יעקב, and the description of the vision) is to be recognized. In vv. 1aα,28-34, however, the presence of the J document is obvious. Here are found the names Israel, Judah, and Goshen; and also E's story of Pharaoh's invitation to the family seems not to be known. The last part of v. 34 is probably to be deleted from this material, however, because it misunderstands Joseph's intention in talking to Pharaoh, and has the appearance of a gloss.

Genesis XLVII

Vv. 1-4 of this chapter may be assigned with confidence to J because they continue chapter XLVI and discuss the settlement in Goshen. V. 5a is probably to be considered J as a continuation of the story, which is retained in almost complete form at this point, and into which the verses from P have been inserted, although it

is possible that this phrase is ultimately from the hand of P. Vv. 5b,6a,7-11 certainly are to be attributed to P. V. 6b is J because of reference to the land of Goshen; and v. 12 is doubtful but may probably be assigned to E because of the use of כלכל. Vv. 13-26 are difficult. Linguistic evidence is not decisive. Words characteristic of J which appear in the section are כבד and מצא חן. On the other hand, such a word as חזק might indicate the presence of E. A number of words unusual in the Pentateuch are also found here: צרה, אסם, שתל, חמר. Certain considerations make it questionable whether the section is to be attributed to J. Its present location seems somewhat unsuitable for it, since it interrupts the connection between v. 6b and 27a and goes back to describe events which began in the first year of the famine, whereas in the section just preceding, Joseph has brought his family to Goshen since the famine has already proved to be of long duration. Furthermore, it seems strange in J's epic, which is so engrossed in Israel, and only in other countries as they affect Israel, to find a section accounting for the large land tax in Egypt. Joseph's part in managing the situation is only of secondary interest; the author is primarily concerned with the origin of this Egyptian custom, and he has presented it in a digression which seems foreign to the methods of J. It is to be noticed, however, that this problem must be considered in connection with the larger question of the sources of J's knowledge of Joseph's

is possible that this phrase is ultimately from the hand of J. Vv. 3a,6a,7-11 certainly are to be attributed to J. V. 6b is J because of reference to the land of Goshen; and v. 12 is doubtful but may probably be assigned to J because of the use of לבד. Vv. 13-26 are difficult. Linguistic evidence is not decisive. Words characteristic of J which appear in the section are יקר and לא אדע. On the other hand, such a word as פרעה might indicate the presence of E. A number of words unusual in the Pentateuch are also found here: אבן, בור, כרה, ר. Certain considerations make it questionable whether the section is to be attributed to J. Its present location seems somewhat unsuitable for it, since it interrupts the connection between v. 5b and 27a and goes back to describe events which began in the first year of the famine, whereas in the section just preceding, Joseph has brought his family to Goshen since the famine has already proved to be of long duration. Furthermore, it seems strange in J's epic, which is so concerned in Israel, but only in other countries as they affect Israel, to find a section accounting for the large land tax in Egypt. Joseph's part in meeting the situation is only of secondary interest; the author is primarily concerned with the origin of this Egyptian system, and he has presented it in a fragment which seems foreign to the methods of J. It is to be noticed, however, that this problem must be considered in connection with the larger question of the sources of J's knowledge of Joseph's

vicissitudes in Egypt. The Joseph stories are different from most of the J narratives and show an unquestionable knowledge of and interest in Egyptian matters. (Compare Part II, Chapter IV.) Spiegelberg[1] believes that this knowledge is derived from books and oral reports rather than from first- hand acquaintance. If the section in this chapter is of Egyptian origin, although adapted to suit Israelitic tradition, and if J took it over from written sources, as he took Israelitic material for other parts of his epic[2], the questions raised against including this in J's narrative are met in a fairly satisfactory manner. V. 27a appears in large part to be J because of the mention of Goshen, and because it follows well upon v. 6b. The phrase בארץ מצרים, however, seems to be superfluous and is probably to be omitted with Eissfeldt[3] as a part of P. Vv. 27b and 28 are also additions from P's hand. Vv. 29-31 are the work of J because of the use of Israel and מצא חן, and because chapter XLVIII 1, which appears to be E, does not continue this, but makes an entirely new beginning.

Genesis XLVIII

As has just been said, v. 1 of this chapter seems to constitute a fresh beginning of a story and to be

1. Spiegelberg, Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jacob (Gen. 50, 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägypt. Quellen, OLZ, 1923, pp. 421-424.

2. Cf. Part II, Chapter IV.

3. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 98*.

attributable to E. It is continued in 2a, as is to be observed from the use of the name Jacob. V. 2b, however, is usually attributed to J because of the change of the name to Israel and the mention of the bed, as in chapter XLVII 31. Vv. 3-6 are P. V. 7 is highly questionable, but at least it cannot be J. In the succeeding verses a doubled story can be recognized from the fact that in one strand Jacob is blind and in the other he can see. Thus vv. 8 and 9a are apparently from E (note the use of אלהים). V. 9b could belong to either source, but it fits well with 10a,which is J, and is often assigned to that source also. Vv. 11,12,15,16 are all E, while 13,14,17-19 seem to be J. V. 20 is difficult; the first part of the verse duplicates v..15 of E, while the last part practically duplicates vv. 17-19, and likewise contains the word אלהים for god. Some critics, therefore, assign the first three words to J and the last of the verse to E. When this is done, however, it has to be recognized that the words of the blessing in J are not given, a point which makes such an analysis rather doubtful. Vv. 21 and 22 are also difficult, but because of the use of אלהים and the mention of the Amorites they probably are a part of E, and they certainly can not be J.

Genesis XLIX

Vv. 1-27 of this chapter, because of their

indubitably early date, are very widely considered a part of the J document. Certain considerations make this decision doubtful. The chapter will be discussed in connection with J's use of sources in Part II, Chapter IV. For a justification of the rejection of the poem from J the reader is referred to that section.

Genesis L

In this chapter v. 1 is a continuation of the J story of chapter XLVIII. V. 2 is sometimes thought to be unified, but the repetition makes one suspect that two sources are present. If this is so v. 2b, on account of Israel, would be J, and 2a E. V. 3 is also often considered a unit, but the difference in numbers within the verse -- now a ten day period of mourning, and now a period of seventy days-- makes one suspect that two sources are also present here. Vv. 4-9 appear to be J. Vv. 10 and 11 seem somewhat overfull, and because of this fact and the double name of the place it is often suggested that two sources are present here. Possibly v. 10a is E, but it is to be noted that the connection is not good between the various parts of the sources when this division is made. It is probably better to consider the whole verse J. Vv. 12 and 13 are from P, and v. 14 completes J's story of how Joseph returned to Egypt. In the rest of the chapter it is unlikely that J is present; most of the material is E. V. 18, in

which וילכו seems to duplicate what was said in v. 17, is the only possible fragment from J. Since, however, the rest of the incident between Joseph and his brothers is E, and all similar material in the preceding sections was likewise attributed to E, it is very questionable whether J included this incident at all in his epic.

Exodus I

There is general agreement that vv. 6, and 8-10 are to be attributed to J, but the question in this chapter concerns the probability of the retention of other fragments of J in the rest of the chapter. Vv. 1-5,7,13,14, and 20b, the present investigation has concluded, are all to be attributed to P; and vv. 11,12,15-20a,21, and 22 are to be assigned to E, vv. 11 and 12 because of the use of שרי מסים instead of J's expression נגשים, and 15 ff. because the description in these verses of the group of Israelites shows a body of men and women so few in number that two midwives were sufficient to serve the whole community. (This is in contrast to J's conception of the size of the incipient nation living apart in Goshen.) In the material designated above as P, however, some critics consider 7aβ, the two words בחמר ובלבנים in v. 14, and v. 20b J. The presence of many phrases of the same meaning in these verses does suggest the possibility that more than one source is present. The P document, however, is characterized by a love of completeness

leading to redundance, and by a delight in exaggeration. Therefore the heaping of expressions in v. 7 is not unlike P's usual method, and v. 14 describes all the possibilities in the oppression of the Israelites. V. 20b is very similar to 7aβ and also seems to be inserted in its present position with a desire to correct the impression that the people were few in number -- a tendency quite in keeping with P's usual method.

Exodus II

The first ten verses in this chapter are in large part to be attributed to E because of the use of אמה and the interest in Moses's sister. Yet there are various considerations which cause difficulty with this decision. Among them it is striking that in vv. 1-3 Moses appears to be the first-born child, while in v. 4 ff. he has an older sister. E is usually interested in giving names to his minor characters, yet here not even Moses's sister is named, to say nothing of his father and mother and the daughter of Pharaoh. The mention of the house of Levi is also rather unexpected from E. It is questionable to what source vv. 11-15a belong. They appear to suit either J or E equally well and to be almost demanded by both. Linguistic considerations do not give assistance; and the redactor who combined J and E does not seem to have based his work on one source rather than the other,

leading to endurance, and by a delight in exaggeration. Therefore the heaping of expressions in v. 7 is not unlike P's usual method, and v. 14 describes all the possibilities in the oppression of the Israelites. V. 20b is very similar to 7a; and also seems to be inserted in its present position with a desire to correct the impression that the people were few in number -- a tendency quite in keeping with P's usual method.

Exodus II

The first two verses in this chapter are in large part to be attributed to E because of the use of Jethro and the interest in Moses's father. Yet there are various considerations which cause difficulty with this decision. Among them it is striking that in vv. 1-3 Moses appears to be the first-born child, while in v. 4 ff. he has an older sister. E is usually interested in giving names to his minor characters, yet here not even Moses's sister is named, to say nothing of his father and mother and the daughter of Pharaoh. The mention of the house of Levi is also rather unexpected from E. It is questionable to what source vv. 11-15a belong. They appear to suit either J or E equally well and to be almost demanded by both. Linguistic considerations do not give assistance; and the redactor who combined J and E does not seem to have based his work on one source rather than the other.

for vv. 15b-22 are without doubt J, as the mention of Midian, the phrase לתה זה, the interest in shepherd life, and the story of the birth of one son give evidence. There is one observation which seems to make it probable that there is a change of source in v. 11. The phrase ויהי בימים ההם has so little connection with what precedes that it has had to be elucidated by a following phrase, apparently the work of a redactor who recognized that the preceding words were too indefinite as they stood and needed explanation. Vv. 11-15a will therefore have to remain doubtful. It is probable that they are to be attributed to J, but no certainty can be reached in the matter. Vv. 23b-25 in the chapter are clearly P. 23aα, however, is uncertain. Was it once connected with the E section in chapter III 1, or was it once followed by IV 19 (J), as Meyer[1] supposes? This latter suggestion seems quite probable, in which case the verse is out of place and should be inserted after the J material of chapter III and immediately before IV 19. It is also to be observed that the name Reuel in v. 18 is probably a gloss, because elsewhere in the chapter, in accordance with J's custom (note the omission of the name of Joseph's master in Genesis), a name is not given to Moses's father-in-law.

Exodus III

Vv. 2,3, and 4a of this chapter can be easily

1. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 18.

nor vv. 15b-16 are without doubt 1, as the question of whether the nurses of מרע, who intervene in childbirth, are the sisters of the midwife of one nor the evidence. There is one uncertainty which seems to make it probably that there is a change or source in v. 21. The phrase מדין ויצו אותם has so little connection with what precedes that it has not to be validated by a following phrase, especially for work of a redactor who recognizes that the preceding verse has too indefinite a story line and demands explanation. Vv. 21-22a will therefore have to remain doubtful. It is probable that they are to be attributed to 1, but an inadvertency has to be reckoned in 1. Vv. 22b-c in the original are clearly 2. 22b, however, is unsuitable. Has it some connection with the 2 section in chapter 2:1? 1, or one influenced by 2? is (2), as Meyer suggested. This latter suggestion seems quite possible, in which case the verse is not of place and should be inserted after the 2 material of chapter 2:1 and immediately before 2V 1a. It is also to be observed that the word Ferrel in v. 1b is probably a gloss, because clearness in two chapters, in accordance with its meaning, indeed the ordering of the name of Jacob's wife is doubtful, a name is not given to Moses's father-in-law.

Exodus 3:1

Vv. 1,2, and 4a of this chapter can be easily

1. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 72.

separated from the parallel verses of E as a part of the J narrative. V. 5 likewise is probably to be attributed to J, since it is a continuation of 4a, and, as Holzinger[1] says, it "setzt die auf dem Erdboden entgegentretende Theophanie von J voraus." In v. 7 difficulties begin to appear. In b there is a change of suffixes, and the late word תנאבין is used. For this reason Meyer[2] considers the whole of 7b redactional. נגשין seems to be a word which J uses, however, and it is probable that the verse to that point is authentic, and that only the last clause is redactional. V. 8 has much deuteronomic material, and at least 8aβb must be omitted from the narrative of J. Vv. 16-18 are often assigned to J likewise. Here זקני ישראל is often said to be a sign of J, but a study of the occurrences of that expression makes it seem that quite the opposite is the case.[3] The phrase is more likely to indicate the presence of E, D, or a redactor. V. 17 is full of deuteronomic phrases. There is a difficulty, however, in omitting this section entirely from the J narrative. The J material of chapter V, with the best division of sources possible, presupposes a command of Yahweh that the Israelites shall journey to the wilderness in order to make a feast to him. Either, then, the whole of vv. 16-18

1. Holzinger, Exodus, p. 8.

2. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 8.

3. Cf. Part II, Chapter V.

is a deuteronomic substitution for a J section which once stood here commanding the observance of a feast, or the deuteronomists have at this point reworked J material, the original of which they partially preserved in a portion of v. 18. It is to be noted in this connection that Procksch[1] considers vv. 15-17 late deuteronomic material and v. 18 E.

Exodus IV

The first nine verses of this chapter are very difficult. They are usually attributed to J because they are partial duplicates of two of E's miracles, which in that document serve a very different purpose. They have none of the characteristics of J, however, and the description of Moses's use of a rod, and the miracle of water becoming blood, as though the Israelites lived near the river, are quite foreign to the method of J. Furthermore, the emphasis on the verb יאמן, and the style in which the series of three miracles is told signify that this section does not belong to J. Indeed Holzinger[2] has stated that it seems to be somewhat reworked, although in the main he believes that it is drawn from J. Vv. 10-14aα emphasize Yahweh as creator and as a deity who takes a personal interest in the individual, as only late material is accustomed to do. They are therefore not to be considered

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 64.

2. Holzinger, Exodus, p. 9.

is a deuteronomic substitution for a J section which once stood here commenting the observance of a feast, or the deuteronomists have at this point inserted J material, the original of which they partially preserved in a portion of v. 19. It is to be noted in this connection that Procksch[1] considers vv. 15-17 late deuteronomic material and v. 18 a.

Exodus 17

The first nine verses of this chapter are very difficult. They are usually attributed to J because they are partial duplicates of two of E's episodes, which in that document serve a very different purpose. They have many of the characteristics of J, however, and the description of Moses's use of a rod, and the miracle of water becoming blood, so tempt the Israelites lived near the river, are quite fitting to the method of J. Furthermore, the emphasis on the very (vv. 6), and the style in which the series of three episodes is told signify that this section does not belong to J. Indeed religious and ethnic ideas[2] seem to be somewhat heterogeneous, although in the main to believe that it is drawn from J. Vv. 10-14a emphasize Yahweh as creator and as a deity who takes a personal interest in the individual, an early late matter-of-fact is considered to do. They are therefore not to be considered

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 64.
2. Holzinger, Exodus, p. 8.

a part of J. Vv. 14aβ-18, likewise, because of their emphasis on Aaron the Levite, their comparison of Moses to God, the mention of the rod, and the use of the name Jethro, are not to be attributed to J. Vv. 19,20a seem to be J, however, with the correction of יתרו in v. 20 to יתר. Here Midian is given as the land in which Moses lived in the years following his flight from Egypt. With the reconstruction suggested above, therefore, these verses will stand immediately after chapter II 23a, which in its turn follows the J material of chapter III. Vv. 24-26, because of their primitive character, are likewise to be attributed to J.[1] Vv. 27 and 28, however, surely are not a part of that document, but in all probability are to be assigned to E, because of the mention of the sacred mount. Vv. 29-31 are often assigned to J, but the correctness of this analysis is much to be doubted. Aaron is mentioned here, as well as the elders; and a brief summary such as is found in these verses is not characteristic of the style of J. Furthermore the emphasis on the belief of the people is quite unlike that document.

Exodus V

In the first nine verses of this chapter doublets are quite generally recognized, but there is apparently no way in which it is possible to form a confident decision

1. For a further consideration of this section compare Part II, Chapter IV.

to which source each set is to be attributed. Vv. 3 and 8 seem to refer to chapter III 18, but because it is doubtful whether that verse is to be considered J these verses likewise can not be attributed with assurance to that source. In contrast to the point of view just stated many critics have come to exactly the opposite conclusion. Procksch[1] is of the opinion, however, that these verses are to be attributed to E. It would seem most likely, therefore, that in vv. 1,2,5,6,7,9 the J document is to be found, while vv. 3,4, and 8 are a part of E.[2] In the rest of the chapter it may be that two sources are present, but apart from v. 11b, which seems to refer to v. 8, it is difficult to detect them. The presence of the two kinds of officials who, in the present text, have been set to enforce the oppressive regulations, suggests that two independent narratives may have been conflated; particularly since an explanatory phrase has been added in v. 14 after שׁטרי בני ישׂראל when the term has already been used twice in the chapter as though it needed no explanation. It is difficult, however, to come to any satisfactory division of sources by the use of נגשים and שׁטרים, and the presence of העם and עבדיך makes it appear that the section is very largely to be assigned to J.

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 69.

2. V. 6 seems to belong to J because of the use of הנגשים, which stands in contrast to E's expression שׂרי מסים of chapter I 11; and v. 7 is a doublet of v. 8.

Exodus VI

The only place in this chapter where J could be found is v. 1, and that that is J is the opinion of the majority of critics because of the fact that this verse is an answer to chapter V 22 f. Yet it appears that there once existed an E narrative parallel to the J material of chapter V, as the first of the chapter indicates, although the attempt to distinguish two sources in the latter part of the chapter was unsuccessful. V. 1 of chapter VI, then, is probably a part of the E source which the redactor retained in his work because he liked the forcefulness of the characteristic E phrase ב״ד חזקה which is used twice in this sentence. It is to be observed that the story of the J narrative flows smoothly and nothing seems to be missing between the end of chapter V and the continuation of J in chapter VII 14.

Exodus VII

In this chapter the first thirteen verses are clearly P. In 14-29, however, J, E, and P are obviously intermingled. P can be easily separated from J and E in vv. 19,20aα,21b, and 22. It is more difficult to be certain of the separation of J and E. J seems to be concerned with the pollution of the water because of the death of the fish, while E is concerned with the pollution of the water because of its turning to blood. Because of the common

interest in the two narratives the redactor felt at liberty to join them. It is therefore understandable that in places the same thing may have been said by both J and E, as seems to have been the case in vv. 21 and 24. The division of sources, then, may be carried out as follows: v. 14, which connects well with chapter V, is to be attributed to J, as is suggested by the expression כבד לב. V. 15a is sometimes attributed as a whole to J, but that this is correct is rather uncertain.[1] Baentsch has noted that E is interested in Egyptian customs, such as Pharaoh's going to the river; also aβ appears to be a doublet of a part of aα; furthermore, since the last part of the verse is E or later material, as is shown by the mention of the rod, which does not appear in J, it is quite possible that E material may have been worked into the first half of the verse also. Only 15aα is then to be attributed to J. V. 16 seems to belong to J, although it is not certain that the expression God of the Hebrews has appeared in that source before. There seems to be no reason why the J document should not employ it, however. V. 17a is to be assigned to J, and v. 17b is clearly E. 18 connects well with 17a if the initial ו is omitted, and it gives the specific content of the J story as distinguished from E. 20aβb continues the E story, while 21a is a good continuation

1. Baentsch, Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, p. 60.

of J. 23a refers to 15aβ, which, it has been suggested, is probably E, and 23b, at least as far as the word בדם is concerned, is redactional -- the work of a man who had in mind the P material of the early part of the chapter. V. 24, as has been suggested above, is a partial doublet of 21a, and should probably be considered a part of E, continuing vv. 20aβb and 23a, and containing the statement which suggested to the redactor the advisability of combining the two stories of J and E. V. 25 is usually assigned to J because he likes to give a definite time limit for the plagues. Vv. 26-29 appear to constitute a straightforward section of J narrative. It is to be observed in this section in how much simpler a way the story is told than in the opening part of the story of the plague of polluted water. Furthermore Yahweh himself is to be the worker of the miracle, and no mention is made of Moses's rod. These considerations assist in establishing the correctness of the judgment that in the earlier part of the chapter the work of two hands was present.

Exodus VIII

The separation of the P material from the rest is quite simple again in this chapter, and after the removal of this source the remaining material seems to be essentially J. E apparently is not present. In v. 16 are expressions which closely resemble v. 15 of the preceding chapter, but

there is no reason why the material common to both verses could not belong to J. Vv. 21-23 are attributed by Procksch[1] to E on the ground that v. 24 is a doublet of 21, not a continuation of 23, and also because he likewise attributes the similar sections later on to E. He considers this a very suitable conclusion of the E story of chapter VII. If chapter VII 23 and 24 are E, however, as has been suggested above, no further conclusion is needed for that story, although it is obvious throughout that E is retained in a very fragmentary condition, whereas J formed the basis of the redactor's work. Furthermore, the similar sections in later chapters are generally assigned to J, against the opinion of Procksch. There are evidences of the hand of the redactor in places, as in the addition of Aaron in vv. 4 and 8, and the corresponding change in number in the verb in v. 4. Vv. 6bβ and 18b likewise sound deuteronomic, and in the same spirit apparently is the word הוֹאֹת in v. 19b, which considers these occurrences signs rather than plagues.

Exodus IX

Vv. 1-7 of this chapter are in great part J, although v. 3aβ is questioned because of the list of animals of Egypt which sounds like the work of a learned glossator, particularly since camels were not in Egypt at this time.[2]

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 72.

2. Erman-Ranke, Aegypten, p. 586.

there is no reason why the material comes to light sooner. [1] could not refer to 5. Vv. 31-32 are additional to Proverbs 1-9 on the ground that v. 34 is a duplicate of 29, not a continuation of 30, and also because in itself it includes the similar sentiment later on in 6. Ir. Goldthorpe finds a very intricate connection of ideas in a study of chapter VII. If chapters VII 32 and 33 are 5, however, as has been suggested above, no further consideration is needed for that chapter, although it is perhaps impossible that 5 is retained in a very fragmentary condition, whereas 1 forms the basis of the redactor's work. Furthermore, the similar sentiment in later chapters are equally assigned to 1, whatever the opinion of Fraenkel. There are evidences of the good of the redactor in places, as in the addition of Amen in vv. 4 and 5, and the corresponding change in number in the verb in v. 4. Vv. 1-6 and 12b literally sound deuteronomic, and in the same spirit apparently is the word ~~ר~~ in v. 10, which contradicts three parallelisms which follow.

Chapter 12

Vv. 1-7 of this chapter are in great part 1, although v. 3a1 is questioned because of the lack of antecedents of Kappt which sounds like the work of a learned glossator, particularly since Gomelle were not in Egypt at late time.[2]

1. Fraenkel, The Gottingensis, p. 77.

2. Erman-Ranke, Aegypten, p. 620.

Vv. 8-12 are P. The rest of the chapter is so badly reworked that a definite decision is not always possible. V. 13 is undoubtedly J, but vv. 14-16 sound like the work of a deuteronomic redactor exaggerating the acts of Yahweh. Vv. 17 and 18 probably belong to J since Yahweh himself is to perform the acts. Vv. 19-21 are surely not a part of J, for it is E rather than J who describes so violent a storm, and the pious remarks of vv. 20 and 21 are foreign to the J source. Vv. 22 and 23a appear to belong to E, and 23b to J, although the decision is uncertain since vv. 33 and 34 describe thunder as a part of the storm, and they are often attributed to J. Vv. 24b and 25b are probably to be attributed to J, although the verses as a whole do not seem to be assignable to one source, because of the unpleasantness of the repetition of the word <u>hail</u> therein. V. 26 is surely to be considered J. 27 is highly questionable, for J is not usually concerned to note his characters' admission of guilt or failure. It may be much reworked, and possibly should read simply וישלח פרעה ויקרא לאשה ויאמר, with the rest of the verse omitted; yet against this is to be noted the similar section in chapter X. V. 28 is difficult, for the construction of ורב תהיה קלת אלהים וברד is unusual in this source. What emendation should be made in the text, however, is quite uncertain. V. 29 also seems to be reworked. bβ

Vv. 9-12 are P. The rest of the chapter is so badly reworked that a definite decision is not always possible. V. 13 is undoubtedly J, but vv. 14-16 sound like the work of a deuteronomic redactor exaggerating the sins of Israel. Vv. 17 and 18 probably belong to J since Yahweh himself is to perform the acts. Vv. 19-21 are surely not a part of J, for it is a rather clean J who describes so violent a storm, and the pious remarks of vv. 20 and 21 are foreign to the J source. Vv. 22 and 23a appear to belong to E, and 23b to J, although the decision is uncertain since vv. 33 and 34 describe thunder as a part of the storm, and they are often attributed to J. Vv. 24b and 25b are probably to be attributed to J, although the verses as a whole do not seem to be attributable to one source, because of the unclearness of the repetition of the word <u>hail</u> therein. V. 26 is surely to be considered J. 27 is highly questionable, for J is not usually concerned to note his characters' admission of guilt or failure. It may be much reworked, but possibly should read simply [illegible], with the rest of the verse omitted; yet against this is to be noted the similar section in chapter X. V. 28 is difficult, for the occasions of [illegible] is unusual in this source. What emendation should be made in the text, however, is quite uncertain. V. 29 also seems to be reworked. b

resembles the other phrases which have been designated as glosses of a deuteronomic redactor; but also the suggestion of Moses's increased importance in causing the plague to stop ("I will spread abroad my hands unto Yahweh") is suspicious in this source. Vv. 30-32 are quite generally recognized as redactional work. 33, with its emphasis on the efficacy of Moses's spreading abroad his hands, is questionable, as is also the mention of thunder and rain. V. 34, because of the similar mention of rain and thunder, and also because it stresses Pharaoh's sin, seems not to be simple J material. V. 35, because of the use of כאשר דבר and the statement that the result had been previously foretold, is hardly to be considered J. 35a might be E.

Exodus X

The analysis of this chapter, in determining that the greater part of the material is from J, agrees very largely with the consensus of opinion. Vv. 1b and 2, however, are to be considered deuteronomic. 12 and 13aα are obviously not J and may be assigned readily to E. It is difficult to attain any certainty concerning vv. 14 and 15. 14aβb seems to be similar to part of vv. 4 and 6, and for that reason is often assigned to the same source. V. 15a appears to refer to v. 5, and so is likewise assigned to J. 15b is considered E simply because it appears to be unnecessary after the preceding material in

the J source. Vv. 16 and 17 are difficult. They resemble v. 27 of the preceding chapter. In the Joseph stories, it will be recalled, it was the E writer who showed that the brothers were conscious of their sin and attributed their troubles to their misdeeds. No such reflective mood was apparent in J. For that reason it would be more satisfactory if it could be determined that these verses were not J. Yet some similar material is needed before vv. 18 and 19. Furthermore, it is strange that v. 24 should follow upon v. 19. If Pharaoh has gained his purpose why should he offer a concession to Moses? The suggestion presents itself that possibly vv. 24-26 once stood in the place of vv. 16 and 17, yet they do not lead up to vv. 18 and 19. It would be expected, from analogy with preceding material, that they would stand between the threat of a coming plague and its fulfilment. From the way in which the following material is worded, however, it appears that J must have made a variation in this last case and that such a rearrangement is not possible. V. 27, because it says that Yahweh hardened Pharaoh's heart, apparently belongs to E, for J always says that Pharaoh hardened his own heart.

Exodus XI

Vv. 1-3 are either a part of E, or else material which has been introduced here by R^{JE}. Note the similarity of the section to chapter III 22. Note also that in v. 29 of chapter X it was stated that Moses was not to see Pharaoh

again. These verses make it appear that v. 4 begins a new interview rather than that it was a continuation of the previous heated conversation, as was probably the case. In v. 5 the appearance of שפחה indicates that vv. 4-8 are to be attributed to the J document. Vv. 9 and 10 form a conclusion to the section of miracles, either placed here by P or by a redactor.

Exodus XII

The first twenty verses of this chapter are to be assigned unquestionably to the Priestly source, but in vv. 21-28 there is considerable question to what document the material does belong. Because of the style of v. 28 this verse is generally attributed to P. Vv. 24-27 contain so many deuteronomic phrases that they are to be attributed to that school of writers. It is usually said that vv. 21-23 are a part of J, largely because of the mention of the elders of Israel therein. As has been said above, it is the conviction of the present writer that the phrase זקני ישראל is not characteristic of the J document,[1] but that quite the opposite is the case. Furthermore, the section interrupts the sequence between chapter XI 8 and chapter XII 29. It presupposes that the Israelites are living in the midst of the Egyptians, whereas J states that they are separated from them in the land of Goshen.

1. Cf. Part II, Chapter V.

again. These verses make it appear that v. 4 begins a new literary rather than that it was a continuation of the previous dated conversation, as was probably the case. In v. 5 the appearance of Jerusalem indicates that vv. 1-8 are to be attributed to the 1 document. Vs. 9 and 10 form a conclusion to the section of miracles, either placed here by P or by a redactor.

Lesson XIII

The first twenty verses of this chapter are to be assigned unquestionably to the Priestly source, but in vv. 21-28 there is considerable question to what document this material was belong. Because of the style of v. 23 this verse is generally attributed to P. Vs. 24-27 contain so many non-Johannic phrases that they are to be attributed to that school of writers. It is usually said that vv. 21-22 are a part of J. Largely because of the position of the clause of Israel therein. As has been said above, it is the conviction of the present writer that the phrase "ἐν τῷ" is not characteristic of the J document, but just quite the opposite is the case. Furthermore, the section interrupts the sequence between chapter XI 3 and chapter XII 20. It presupposes that the Israelites are living in the midst of the Egyptians, whereas J states that they are separated from them in the land of Goshen.

1. Cf. Part II. Chapter V.

It considers that the plague will be brought about by a destroyer, an agent of Yahweh, rather than by Yahweh himself. It commands that none of the people shall go out until morning, whereas in the immediately following section they go out in the middle of the night. It makes use of the verb נתן in the meaning permit. For these reasons it is quite certain that no J is present in the chapter until v. 29. V. 29, however, follows well after chapter XI 4-8, describing the accomplishment of the threat which was made there. V. 30 also accompanies it because of its resemblance to chapter XI 6. It might be expected that E material would be found in this section, since the story is of such importance in Hebrew tradition, and acting on this expectation many critics attribute v. 31 to the E source. Vv. 31 and 32, however, appear to go together, and v. 32 refers to the J material of chapter X 26, while v. 31 is written with the recollection of v. 8 of chapter XI. It is sometimes thought that v. 33 marks a change of source from E to J because it is believed that chapter X 28 and 29 were written with the intention of showing that Moses never saw Pharaoh again, but that it was the Egyptians who urged him to leave, and that chapter XIV 5 describes the genuine surprise of Pharaoh at the departure of the people, contrary to what would have been possible if vv. 31 and 32 of this chapter had been a part of the story. There is a real difficulty in the analysis at this point,

yet vv. 31 and 32 do seem to refer to previous material which it is difficult to assign to E, and so it seems most satisfactory to leave the difficulty unsolved and attribute, at least temporarily, vv. 29-33 to J. Vv. 35 and 36 appear to be E because of their reference to chapter XI 1-3. V. 34 obviously goes with v. 39; and in 39b it is to be noticed that there seems to be a reference to chapter XI 1. It is also to be questioned whether J would give such a pathetic description of the people's circumstances unless by so doing he could show the origin of some name or rite. It would be expected from E, but not from J. Then the question arises whether the author intended to describe at this point the origin of the Feast of Unleavened Bread. It is characteristic of the J writer, however, whenever he uses a description or anecdote with a definite purpose in mind to assure himself that his idea is perfectly clear in the minds of his readers by the addition of a pointed, straightforward statement of his purpose at the conclusion of the section. Compare in this respect the numerous etymologies of J. Such a statement is lacking here. For these reasons, particularly because of the reference to chapter XI 1, it is probable that these verses are to be attributed to E rather than to J. Vv. 37 and 38 are also difficult. 37a describes the beginning of the journey in the style of P, and it is also most unlikely that J would limit the Israelites in Egypt to the city of Rameses.

The exaggerated numbers in the last part of the verse also seem unlike J. V. 38 is more according to his style. The J document has previously emphasized the importance of the whole group's going together with the flocks accompanying them, and v. 38 makes the statement that that was what took place. The phrase כבד מאד also has been used frequently before by the J writer. So it seems probable that the verse is to be attributed to J. The rest of the chapter belongs to P.

Exodus XIII

In this chapter vv. 21 and 22 are attributed universally to J. Here Yahweh himself conducts the people, although in a pillar of cloud or fire. In the next chapter the parallel conception of E is made clear. According to E it was necessary that an angel should take over that function. None of the other verses of the chapter are attributable to J. Vv. 1,2, and 20 are P. Vv. 3-16 are from a deuteronomic redactor, as is assured by the reference to the house of bondage and by the didactic tone of the whole; and vv. 17-19 are apparently E because of the use of אלהים and the similarity to Gen. L.

Exodus XIV

This chapter comes at so important a moment in the tradition that all the sources are represented and so

closely intermingled that it is difficult to reach any satisfactory analysis. Vv. 5-7, because of doublets, probably include both J and E. 5a is usually assigned to J because it seems to be in accordance with chapter X, in which it was said that no further interview would take place between Moses and Pharaoh, thereby suggesting that a departure could not be made with Pharaoh's consent. What difficulties arise in chapter XII as a result of this view have been noted already. Is it a satisfactory explanation of the verse at present under consideration to state that in chapter XII when Pharaoh gave his permission for the departure he did not intend that there should be a permanent separation, but that there should be only a brief absence for the purpose of a religious feast? Such at least was probably the idea of the redactor when he combined the sources. There is little evidence to determine whether 5b is from J or from E. The repetition of the verb קום in 6b and 7a suggests that two different sources must be present here, whose combination produced this uneven style. 7aβ is more like the work of an exaggerating redactor than the work of one of the authors of the sources. Vv. 8 and 9 appear to be P. 10aα is assigned to J because of the use of מצרים in the singular, which is a grammatical peculiarity used by commentators as one criterion for the presence of J. 10bβ is usually given to P because it

closely intermingled that it is difficult to reach any satisfactory analysis. Vv. 6-7, because of conflate, probably involve both J and E. Gn is usually assigned to J because it seems to be in accordance with chapter 4, in which it was said that no further intercourse would take place between Joseph and Pharaoh, thereby suggesting that a departure could not be made with Pharaoh's consent. What difficulties arise in chapter XII as a result of this view have been noted already. Is it a satisfactory explanation of the verse at present under consideration to state that in chapter XII when Pharaoh gave his permission for the departure he did not intend that there should be a permanent separation, but that there should be only a brief absence for the purpose of a religious feast? Such at least was probably the idea of the redactor when he combined the sources. There is little evidence to determine whether 3b is from J or from E. The repetition of the verb מלא in 3a and 3b suggests that two different sources must be present here, whose combination produced this uneven style. Vv. 8 and 9 appear to be E. 10abc is assigned to J because of the use of לבדו in the singular, which is a grammatical peculiarity used by commentators as one criterion for the presence of J. 10bb is usually given to P because it

contains the conception that the people cried to Yahweh rather than that Moses cried in fear to God, as in v. 15 (E), or that they cried complainingly to Moses, as in vv. 11-14. The latter verses are then J. V. 16 is divided between E and P. V. 17 is probably P, as is also 18. 19a is E, and 19b (cf. XIII 21,22) is J. V. 20 is very difficult. The text is obscure, and although both E and J are probably represented, no certainty can be reached in dividing the verse. V. 21, because of its varying conception of the nature of the miracle and the way in which it was brought about, is divided between J and P. 21aβγ is J. Vv. 22 and 23 are P. V. 24, because of its mention of the pillar of cloud and fire, is assigned to J. V. 25b is usually assigned to J because it follows suitably v. 24, whereas 25a is given to E for the reason that it is unnecessary after 24. V. 26 again is P; and 27 is to be divided between P and J -- 27aβγb is J. 28 in large part is to be assigned to P or E, although 28b follows well upon 27b, which is J, and could be attributed to that source. V. 29 is certainly not J and may belong to P. V. 30 is attributed to J because of its description of the way in which the promise of v. 13 was carried out, the use of נשׂא, as in the earlier verse, and of מצרים with a singular verb. V. 31 seems to be a unit and to be written with a didactic purpose. Note also the expression <u>his servant Moses</u>. The verse is probably the work of R^d.

Exodus XV

The first nineteen verses of the chapter comprise the Song of the Sea, which is certainly not J. Vv. 20 and 21 are probably the work of E because of the reference to Miriam, who is called a נביאה. V. 25b, with its reference to the חק and משפט, and v. 26 are clearly to be attributed to R^d. Vv. 22-25a and 27 are difficult. They do not contain expressions which are positive criteria for either J or E. The simple expression Israel and the mention of the three days'journey might appear now in either source. It is because, however, v. 22 connects well with chapter XIV 30, because J is fond of etymologies introduced by על-כן קרא-שם, and because the miraculous in vv. 24 and 25a is not too greatly exaggerated that it seems probable that J is the source which is present in these verses.

Exodus XVI

The analysis of this chapter is very doubtful because of the thorough way in which the men who compiled the material worked. That the chapter is composite is shown by the statement "and Moses and Aaron said" in v. 6 and "and Moses said" in v. 8 with no intervening change of subject, by the doublet in v. 35, and by the presence of both deuteronomic and priestly ideas. Note, for example, the emphasis on proving the people in v. 4, on the establishment of the Sabbath, on teaching later generations

(vv. 32-34), and on the other hand the use of the term congregation (עדה), כבוד יהוה, and ארץ כנען. In addition to these two strands of material it is usually supposed that some of JE is likewise present. It is very difficult, however, to select verses which are free from late material and simply told, and which likewise in any way approach an independent, fairly complete narrative of their own. V. 4, for example, is often attributed to J because it makes use of the verb כסה which has elsewhere been employed by J. There is no particular reason, however, why the word should not be used by other writers, and it certainly is a common term in late books. Furthermore v. 4b can not be J, since the interest in proving the people and in their obedience to the law is not found in that source. The most probable place for the discovery of JE material in this chapter will be found to be vv. 11-14. Here, with the possible exception of v. 12b, there is a freedom from characteristically deuteronomic ideas. The popular etymology of the word manna (v. 15) is in the style and interest of J (cf. the similar etymology of the word Sinai in chapter III 2 f.). What is not satisfactory in the present section, however, is the combination of the gift of quails and of manna in one story. Numbers XI is to present the story of the gift of quails, and the mention of their arrival in vv. 12 and 13 is premature and disturbing, particularly since vv. 13b and 14 are so worded that they presuppose the existence of

12 and 13a. Whether or not any J material is to be found in this section therefore will have to remain a matter of doubt. J may have supplied the basis on which a later writer worked, but what verses are directly from his hand is most uncertain.

Exodus XVII

The analysis of this chapter also presents difficulties. P appears only in v. 1a, where his characteristic framework is found. Vv. 3-6 seem to be a unit, and because of the mention of the זקני ישראל, the rod as a means of producing water, and Horeb, the section is assigned to E. The highly miraculous element in vv. 8-16, as well as the interest in Joshua, are factors which indicate the presence of the same document in this section also. The source of vv. 1b,2, and 7 is then undetermined. These verses bear no marks which are positive criteria of J, but the fact that they are practically doublets of vv. 3-6 has brought very many critics to the opinion that they are the work of the J writer. There are certain difficulties with that decision, however. It is very noticeable that in the appearance of the two names Massah and Meribah for the same place there is an evidence of compilation of sources. Furthermore the repetition of the story of Meribah in chapter XX of Numbers apart from the story of Massah, and the mention in Deut. VI 16 and IX 22 of the way in which

the people tempted Yahweh at Massah without mention of Meribah are additional points giving evidence of the same thing. The conciseness of the present section also suggests that at this point a fragment of what was once a longer story is retained. It is quite possible, therefore, that in the story of Meribah a redactor has preserved a fragment of J narrative which he combined with the story of Massah, which was similar to it, although because the idea of tempting the deity is more in accordance with deuteronomic thought the story of Massah was probably of later development.

Exodus XVIII

The analysis of this chapter is very doubtful. The greater part of the chapter, because of the appearance of Jethro and the use of אלהים and of הר אלהים, is to be attributed to E. The mention of the two sons of Moses is also contrary to the custom of the J narrative. On the other hand, in vv. 1-12 a variation in the word for God appears -- now יהוה, and now אלהים is found. In vv. 13-27 אלהים alone is used. Furthermore vv. 1,5, and 10 appear to contain doublets. Did J once contain a narrative telling of the arrival of his father-in-law? Nu. X makes it seem probable that he did; but there is no indication that it was similar to this account of the E document. R^{JE}, evidently using E as a basis, however, preserved fragments

of the J narrative in his compilation of the present chapter. Some of these fragments of J might be the following: 1a (כהן תדין חתן תשה)b,5(אל-המדבר אשר הוא חנה שם),7(note that an interest in the etiquette of the meeting of two friends is characteristic of J),10b. Because this analysis takes no account of the variation in the use of יהוה and אלהים these suggestions are by no means satisfactory, and the question must be left unsettled.

Exodus XIX

In this chapter the narrative has reached a point of supreme interest to Judaism throughout its history, and for that reason the material has been reworked and elaborated until a recognition of the authors responsible for the different parts is almost impossible. The hands of the deuteronomist, of the priestly writer, and of E are evident. Most scholars believe that J is also represented. It is possible that this is true in v. 2aβ, although 2aα seems like P, and 2b like E. 3a, because of the use of אלה"ם, is probably to be attributed to E. Vv. 3b-9, because of the mention of the covenant between God and man, the priests, the elders, the wide extent of the deity's authority, and the importance of the belief of the people, are probably the work of deuteronomists. V. 10 can not belong to J because of the use of the word וקדשתם which is quite unlike that writer; it may be E. With v. 10 seem to belong vv. 11-13 and also 14 and 15, although to many critics

it appears probable that different sources are to be found in these verses. An interest in ritual, however, for the sake of avoiding pollution is of no interest to J, and for that reason there should be considerable hesitation in assigning any of the verses in this section to him. In vv. 22-25 are references to the priests and to Aaron which show clearly that J is not present. Vv. 16-21, however, are more doubtful. Two strands are to be distinguished in which on the one hand the people are curious and to be restrained, while on the other they are fearful at the presence of the deity. Of these vv. 16,17, and 19 are to be attributed to E on account of the presence of אלהים. Vv. 18,20, and 21 are those which might possibly belong to J. It is to be noted that v. 20 repeats a part of v. 18, and so by Procksch[1], in its first half at least, is considered a gloss. Eissfeldt[2], however, uses the doublet as evidence for the presence of a fourth source at this point. It seems to be clear that if J is present in this chapter it is retained in very fragmentary form in vv. 2aβ,18,20a, and 21, which certainly constitute no complete narrative, and which furthermore do not connect readily with the preceding and following sections of J which are now available. It would seem most probable to the present writer that a notice of the arrival in Sinai from J has been preserved

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 85.

2. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, p. 46.

[illegible]

1. [illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

2. [illegible], [illegible], p. [illegible].

here in v. 2aβ but that the rest of the material is the work of E, P, and elaborating deuteronomists.

Exodus XXIII

The only verses in this chapter which suggest the possibility of the presence of J are vv. 29 and 30, where the conquest is conceived as a slow and gradual process. Whether or not these ultimately come from a J section, there is no question that they are out of place at this point, and that their present setting is owing to a redactor who was familiar with the ideas found in the first chapter of Judges and occasionally in Joshua, and introduced them into the rest of the material of this chapter.

Exodus XXIV

Some critics divide the chapter among J, E, and P, assigning vv. 3-8,12-15a,18b to E, 1,2,9-11 to J, and 15b-18a to P.[1] This analysis is most uncertain, particularly in the verses considered to be J. It has been said above that the presence of the elders of Israel is very doubtful in J. Just as doubtful are Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu. Vv. 10 and 11 contain a description such as is found in Isaiah's call, but which is not characteristic of J, particularly since all anthropomorphism is removed. It seems quite certain that no J material is present in this chapter.

1. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 394.

here in v. 5a but that the rest of the material is the work of E, P, and elaborating deuteronomists.

Exodus XXIII

The only verses in this chapter which suggest the possibility of the presence of J are vv. 29 and 30, where the conquest is conceived as a slow and gradual process. Whether or not these ultimately come from a J section, there is no question that they are out of place at this point, and that their present setting is owing to a redactor who was familiar with the ideas found in the first chapter of Judges and occasionally in Joshua, and introduced them into the rest of the material of this chapter.

Exodus XXIV

Some critics divide the chapter among J, E, and P, assigning vv. 3-8,18-15a,18b to E, 1,2,9-11 to J, and 15b-18a to P.[1] This analysis is most uncertain, particularly in the verses considered to be J. It has been said above that the presence of the elders of Israel is very doubtful in J. Just as doubtful are Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu. Vv. 10 and 11 contain a description such as is found in Isaiah's call, one which is not characteristic of J, particularly since all anthropomorphism is removed. It seems quite certain that no J material is present in this chapter.

1. Bright man, Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 334.

Exodus XXXII

The chapter is very questionable. At least two sources are to be found, for vv. 9-14 are inserted within the rest of the chapter. They are probably the work of deuteronomic writers. In v. 15 ff. are references to chapter XXIV 13, a section which is probably to be considered E. Vv. 25-29 concern the establishment of the priesthood among the Levites, a matter wholly foreign to J. And vv. 30-34, with their interest in idolatry, sin, and the great record book of God, are totally different from any of the rest of the chapter. Throughout the whole of this chapter appear references to idolatry and the sin of Jeroboam in a way which is suspicious for writers of the eighth, ninth, or tenth centuries.

Exodus XXXIII

This chapter contains the work of late redactors rather than J material. Vv. 1-3 are often thought to belong to J because v. 1 resembles the promises which were found in Genesis. Such promises, however, are just as possible in other sources as in J, and vv. 2 and 3 are full of deuteronomic expressions, so it is very doubtful if any J is the basis of this section. Vv. 12-23, because of the frequent use of מצא חן and אנ, are often attributed to J also. That this decision is not satisfactory is to be seen from the fact that the section is obviously composite.

Sandra Kahil

The chapter is very questionable. We lacked two sources one can be trusted, for vv. 1-12 are incorrect within the rest of the chapter. They are remarkably the work of Deuteronomic writers. In v. 13 ff. are addressed to chapter XXV 12, a section which is concerned to be continuous w. 14. 15-20 concerns the Amalekites or the relationship among the Israelites, a matter totally foreign to 1. And vv. 21-24, with their interest in looting, etc, and the great number such as 300, are totally different from any of the rest of the chapter. Nevertheless the result of this analysis contradicts to tradition and the aim of harmonism is a very valid in analysis for motives of our "Lord", right, or with confusion.

Sandra Kahil

This chapter contains the work of late redactors rather than 1 individual. Vv. 1-4 are going through to United to 2 Samuel v. 1 mentions the promises made after Saul is dead. Such prevailing, however, the list of motives is about another in vv 7. And vv. 8 and 9 are full of Deuteronomic phrases, so it is very doubtful if any 1 is the cause of this section. Vv. 1-10. Because of the Deuteronomic use of [illegible] 23, are more characteristic of 1 also. Such this division is not satisfactory it is to be read from the fact that the [illegible] is obviously complete.

Vv. 18-23 have nothing to do with the purpose which Moses was trying to achieve in vv. 12-17. Moses now desires to have a personal glimpse of God, not to secure his continual presence with the people. Furthermore, the style is profuse and verbose. The reference to the כבוד יהוה is like P or a deuteronomist, but unlike J.[1] For these reasons it is probable that no J is present in this chapter.

Exodus XXXIV

For the analysis of this chapter compare the article of Professor Pfeiffer on The Oldest Decalogue (JBL, 1924, vol. XLIII, p. 294 ff.).

Numbers X

That vv. 29-32 belong to J various considerations show: in v. 29 Moses's father-in-law is not called Jethro, but Hobab (if חתן is considered to be in apposition to לחבב, as Ju. IV 11 suggests.[2] Possibly, however, as Holzinger, following Wellhausen, suggests, the names in v. 29 are redactional, and Moses's father-in-law was unnamed in J.); the guidance of the people is in the hands of a person rather than entrusted to the deity, as in E; the expressions מולדת, נא, and כי על כן are characteristic of J. Furthermore, in the E section of Ex. XVIII it was said that Moses's father-in-law

1. The expression occurs in P strata twelve times (Ex. XVI 10, XXIV 16,17, XXIX 43, XL 34,35, Lev. IX 6,23, Nu. XIV 10, XVI 19, XVII 7, XX 6) and in deuteronomic material six times (Ex. XVI 7, XXXIII 18,22, Nu. XIV 21,22, Deut. V 21), but not elsewhere.

2. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 75 f.

vv. 18-23 have nothing to do with but purpose which Moses was trying to achieve in vv. 12-17. Moses now desires to have a personal glimpse of God, not to assure his continual presence with the people. Furthermore, the style is prosaic and verbose. The reference to the מקרא as like 2 or 3 deuteronomist, but unlike J. For these reasons it is probable that no J is present in this chapter.

Exodus XXXIV

For the analysis of this chapter compare the article of Professor Steiffer on The Oldest Decalogue (JBL, 1931, vol. XLIII, p. 294 ff.).

Number X

That vv. 29-35 belong to J various considerations show: in v. 29 Moses's father-in-law is not called Jethro, but Hobab (if Jon is considered to be in apposition to מחנו, as Dr. IV 11 suggests. Possibly, however, we Solinger, following William, suggests, the words in v. 29 are redactional, and Moses's father-in-law was mentioned in J.); the guidance of the people is in the hands of a person rather than entrusted to the deity, as in E; the expressions [illegible], [illegible], and [illegible] are characteristic of J. Furthermore, in the section of Ex. XVIII it was said that Moses's father-in-law

1. The expression occurs in P stereotyped times (Ex. XVI 10, XIV 16,17, XXIX 43, XL 34,35, Lev. IX 5,23, Nu. XIV 10, XVI 19, XVII 7, XX 6) and in Deuteronomic material six times (Ex. XVI 7, XXXIII 9,22, Nu. XIV 21,22, Deut. V 21), but not elsewhere.

2. Solinger, Hexateuch, p. 76 f.

returned to his home; it is assumed here that he has remained with the children of Israel until the time for breaking camp should arrive. Vv. 1-28 of the chapter are P, and 33-36 may contain E material in part, but are mostly the work of late writers.[1]

Numbers XI

In this chapter it is evident that several sources have been combined, and the fact that two so dissimilar stories are woven closely together in itself raises a problem, for the redactor formerly has seemed to join only those stories which were much alike. Those verses which it is most certain do not belong to J are 7-9(probably a learned gloss), and 16,17,24b-30, which form either a late strand of E or else are deuteronomic. In vv. 1-3 appears a section which might belong to either source; the part which Moses plays as intercessor, however, has brought many critics to believe that this is E. In the remaining verses evidences of composition are also present. The most obvious of these is found in the fact that in vv. 19-21 the narrative tells that the people are to eat flesh for a month, while in v. 33 the plague falls when they have only begun to eat. There are many other difficulties, however, with assigning much of this to J. In v. 6b the idiomatic expression referring to the manna is very bad Hebrew and is found elsewhere in late Psalms (cf. Gray, Numbers, p. 105,

1. Arnold, Ephod and Ark, p. 139.

returned to this home; it is assumed here that he has remained with the children of Israel until the time for breaking camp should arrive. Vv. 1-28 of the chapter are a, and 29-36 may contain a material in part, but are mostly the work of late writers.[1]

Numbers XI

In this chapter it is evident that several sources have been combined, and the text bears no distinctive stories are woven closely together in itself raises a problem. For the redactor formerly has assumed to join only those stories which were much alike. Those verses which it is most certain to belong to J are 7-9(probably a learned gloss), and 16,17,24b-30, which form either a late strand of J or else are deuteronomic. In vv. 1-3 appears a section which might belong to either source: the part which deals with Taberah, however, has brought many critics to believe that it is E. In the remaining verses evidences of combination are also present. The most obvious of these is found in the fact that in vv. 18-21 the narrative tells that the people are to eat flesh for a month, while in v. 20 the plague tells when they have only begun to eat. There are many other difficulties, however, with assigning each of this to J. In v. 34 the idiomatic expression referring to the manna is very bad Hebrew and is found elsewhere in late Psalms (cf. Gray, Numbers, p. 106).

1. Arnold, Hebrew and Art, p. 173.

where he observes that the idiom is found in Ps. 33^{18} 34^{16} and 123^{2}), so that it seems possible that אין כל בלתי אל-התן עינינו is a later addition. Vv. 11-15 appear verbose, and 14 and 15 seem to anticipate 16 and 17. In v. 18 the people are commanded to sanctify themselves before the gift can be given -- a stipulation unlike J, who lacks interest in ritual obligations. Vv. 21-23 are full of exaggerated statements, and an interest is shown therein in enhancing the power of Yahweh, who by a great miracle will prove his supremacy. Vv. 31 and 32 then show how by natural means this was accomplished -- by the rise of a strong wind from the sea. At this point the presence of J is usually thought to be most obvious, for the miraculous is subordinated in J. Yet even here the very great exaggeration in the number of the quails makes it appear that, whatever kernel of J narrative there may be, it has been much reworked. V. 33, as has been commented above, does not follow vv. 19-21, and it is difficult to find the section which may have preceded it. J, however, can hardly be present here and in v. 34 since the relation between the deity and man is unfriendly, as in the early material of Gen. I-XI, XXXV 5, and XXXVIII. V. 35 appears to belong to the framework of P because of the use of נסעו and the interest in exact definition of the stopping places. Throughout the chapter the linguistic evidence (תעא חן,

עבדך, לתה זה, אל) favors assigning much of the material to J, yet the phrases which are characteristic of J appear in the sections which, it has been shown above, it is difficult to believe are a part of this source. The story seems rather to be dominated by the deuteronomic interest of showing how lack of confidence in Yahweh brings its punishment. In vv. 4-6a, however, there is less difficulty than elsewhere in assigning the material to J. Indeed the idea contained in the unusual word האספסף in v. 4 is very nearly the same as that in ערב of Ex. XII 38, a verse formerly attributed to J. It is here, therefore, that the J document is probably to be found, although this is only a fragment of what once was a much longer narrative. In fact the phrase ועתה נפשנו יבשה of v. 6a stops abruptly and seems to demand some complementary statement, which, however, can not be found in the poor Hebrew of the rest of the verse. How many of the ideas of the original J narrative have been retained in the remainder of the chapter it is now impossible to ascertain with any certainty. As has been shown above, later hands are responsible for most of the rest of the chapter.

Numbers XII

V. 16, which is occasionally attributed to J, like v. 35 of chapter XI, is probably to be assigned to P. Compare נסעו and the interest in locating the stopping

places, which, however, have no particular significance in themselves as sanctuaries, as was the case with the places mentioned in Genesis.

Numbers XIII

In this chapter vv. 1-16 belong to the P source. In v. 17 all three documents are present. P is found in a, J in bα, and E in bβ. V. 18 is very uncertain. It is to be noted that vv. 18,19, and 20 all begin with the same phrase and appear to be doublets. V. 19, because of its interest in the cities, as in later verses in the chapter which are to be attributed to J, is assigned to that source. V. 20, because of its interest in bringing fruit back to the people, is E. To what source, then, does v. 18 belong? Its style does not indicate that it belongs to P, but its similarity to v. 32, a part of which at least is usually considered attributable to the priestly narrative, suggests that it also is from the hand of P. V. 21 is P, and v. 22a, because of its resemblance to 17bα, is J. 22b is a learned gloss quite unlike J, who is not particularly interested in the age of Egyptian cities. Vv. 23 and 24, because of their description of the fruit of the land, are E, and v. 25 is P. V. 26abα, because of its phraseology, is unquestionably P, and bβ of that verse is probably to be given to E. V. 27 may in part be attributable to E, but it appears to have been reworked by a

deuteronomist. V. 28 is probably J, because of the emphasis on the cities. V. 29 is the work of a deuteronomic redactor. Vv. 30 and 31, because of the interest in Caleb,are surely to be attributed to J. V. 32a is certainly from P, and there is no reason why b should not also belong to that source; in which case the whole verse would give a statement of the way in which the command of v. 18 was carried out. V. 33 is a doublet of 28, and in part at least appears to be attributable to E. Both the sources J and E are very fragmentary in this chapter; J in particular has very little of its original narrative left.

Numbers XIV

In this chapter the presence of P and other late writers is obvious. For the presence of the latter compare vv. 11-25, in which are to be observed many deuteronomic phrases and resemblances to Ezekiel. Aside from the work of these writers very little material is present. Possibly fragments from J or E are to be recognized in vv. 1b,3,4,31, and 32. Certainly the reference to the people's sins as whoredoms in v. 33, however, would not be found in J or E, although it is an expression of Hosea. Again in vv. 40-45 material from J or E may be present, with the exception of v. 44bα, which is a deuteronomic addition. The expressions למה זה and כי־על כן make J seem more probable as the author of this last section than E, although such linguistic evidence is certainly very uncertain. Furthermore when these

verses are compared with chapter XXI 1-3 (cf. the discussion of that chapter) the presence of J at this point seems still more doubtful. J is fond of etymologies, and to this source chapter XXI 1-3 is probably to be attributed. Then the earlier mention of Hormah, particularly since it appears in an experience disastrous in its consequences to Israel, is probably to be given either to the E narrative or to a deuteronomist who wanted to show plainly what were the certain results of disobedience. Whether J is present rather than E in vv. 1b,3,4,31, and 32 it is impossible now to say.

Numbers XVI

In this chapter two distinct stories, one concerning Korah, and the other concerning Dathan and Abiram, have been interwoven. The former is from the priestly source, while the latter is from JE. To the latter belong vv. 12-15,25,(26),27b,28-32a,33abα,34. Also redactional phrases have been introduced into the P material making Dathan and Abiram actors in the story, that thereby the union of the sources might be more complete. In the JE material of vv. 12-15 are deuteronomic phrases. In v. 25 is a mention of the elders, and v. 31 is parallel to 32a. All of these indications show that there is neither a pure J narrative here, nor a pure E narrative either. Evidence of the presence of J is found, according to some critics,[1]

1. Holzinger, Numeri, p. 67.

in אדמה in v. 31, in contrast to ארץ of 32a. אדמה is no clearer sign of J than of a deuteronomist (cf. Part II, Chapter V), but it is certainly unlikely to be E. It is possible, then, that v. 31 is derived from J. With this verse goes v. 30, at least in part, for it also contains the word אדמה, although possibly some E may be present. Any attempt at an analysis of the rest of the material is even less satisfactory; possibly some J is present in vv. 33a and 34, yet the distinction between that and E is not obvious.

Numbers XX

In this chapter the hands of P and E are both present. In vv. 14-21 it is E who tells of the attempt to enter the land from the south, but of the refusal of Edom to give permission to do so, since J elsewhere states that the land was entered from the south, and because נתן is used in the meaning <u>permit</u>. The rest of the chapter is largely to be attributed to P. Elements in vv. 1,3, and 5, however, show the presence of another source. The reference to the stay in Kadesh in v. 1 is not likely to be P, but could be attributed to either J or E. The death of Miriam in that verse is probably from the hand of E, who is interested in Moses's sister. V. 3 is a doublet of 2b, and is a repetition of the story of Meribah. V. 5 is a doublet of 4. It seems strange that J should have

told the story of Meribah twice, and on the other hand in neither chapter, it is apparent, is the full story present. Was there only one story in J, fragments of which a redactor in working upon Exodus XVII used at that point where it seemed suitable to him, while R^P later took still different fragments of that story and added them to the P material in this chapter?

Numbers XXI

The first three verses of the chapter are often attributed to J because they break the connection between chapter XX 21 and XXI 4 of the E document, and because they contain the expressions הכנענ׳ and שתע בקול which are common in J. Difficulties with this assignment of the material are found in the existence of two other stories about Hormah, one in Nu. XIV 40-45 and one in Ju. I 17. It is most unlikely that J contained all three references, yet reasons may be offered for attributing all of these sections to J. With regard to the parallel stories in Numbers it may be said that J's interest in etymologies favors the retention of Nu. XI 1-3 in the J document rather than the story of chapter XIV. The single verse in Ju. I which offers a closer parallel to Nu. XXI 1-3 than the section in chapter XIV must be considered at a later time in its relation to the rest of that chapter. In anticipation of the discussion to be offered there, however, it may be

said that the whole of Ju. I is a summary of J material from the hand of a late editor rather than the writing of J himself. Ju. I 17, therefore, offers no obstacle to the inclusion of Nu. XXI 1-3 within the J document. The E document is represented in Nu. XXI 4-9, since the word אלהים is employed therein. Vv. 10-20 are generally attributed in part to P (vv. 10,11a) and in part to JE (11b-20), since the formula for the journeys and camping differs in the two sections and in the latter verses is found the style of Deut. X 6 f.[1] Furthermore v. 11b is known to the author of Deut. II 8. The list of places without accompanying stories to make it interesting, however, is unlike J, who probably is not represented here. It also is probably not to be attributed to E, who in v. 21 supposes that, far from being in the heart of Moab, as the preceding verses supposed, Israel has only reached the border. That vv. 21-24 are to be attributed to E, however, the interest of this section in the Amorites shows. It is possible that vv. 12-20 are the work of a deuteronomist, as has been found to be true in so many earlier chapters. It is also the opinion of the present writer that the formula used to describe the journeys and camping in vv. 16-20 does not vary sufficiently from that of vv. 12-15 to make a change of source probable. Furthermore the Song of the Well is

1. Cf. Gray, Numbers, p. 280.

introduced too awkwardly here to make it seem at all probable that J, who is usually so skilful, has had any part in the work. A change of source appears to be demanded in v. 25, since there is no antecedent for the demonstrative pronoun in the expression these cities. Because vv. 21-24 were thought to be from E, J may be present here. The mention of Amorites, however, makes it doubtful. The explanatory verse 26 is not in the character of J, and with Baentsch[1] may be assigned to a redactor. Of the poem in vv. 27-30 we may quote Brightman, in the Sources of the Hexateuch[2]: "The song, vv. 27-30, is generally believed to come from the ninth century, and originally to reflect Omri's victories over Moab. We., Stade, Meyer, Co., Pr., Smend, et al. view it as a later insertion in E. The context is regarded as E chiefly on account of the Amorites." V. 31, likewise, because of its similarity to v. 24a undoubtedly belongs to the E document. V. 32, however, belongs to the strand of material which discusses the captured cities, and thus may be attributed to the same source as v. 25. Is this J? Vv. 33-35 are to be attributed to neither J nor E but are an interpolation from Deut. III 1 ff.

Numbers XXII and XXIV

Great difficulties are found in determining to what sources chapter XXII is to be assigned, and there is

1. Baentsch, Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, p. 584.
2. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 176.

introduced too awkwardly here to make it seem at all probable that J, who is usually so skillful, has had any part in the work. A change of source appears to be demanded in v. 26, since there is no antecedent for the demonstrative pronoun in the expression <u>these cities</u>. Because vv. 21-24 were thought to be from E, J may be present here. The mention of Amorites, however, makes it doubtful. The explanatory verse 25 is not in the character of J, and with Budde[1] may be assigned to a redactor. Of the poem in vv. 27-30 we may quote Grimme, in the <u>Sources of the Hexateuch</u>[2]: "The song, vv. 27-30, is generally believed to come from the ninth century, and originally to reflect Omri's victories over Moab. We., Stade, Meyer, Gr., Pr., Smend, et al. view it as a later insertion in E. The context is regarded as E chiefly on account of the Amorites." V. 31, likewise, because of its similarity to v. 24 undoubtedly belongs to the E document. V. 32, however, belongs to the strand of material which discusses the captured cities, and thus may be attributed to the same source as v. 26. Is this 17 vv. 23-32 are to be attributed to neither J nor E but are an interpolation from Deut. III 1 ff.

Numbers XXII and XXIII

Great difficulties are found in determining to what sources chapter XXII is to be assigned, and there is

1. Bentzen, <u>Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri</u>, p. 184.
2. Grimme, <u>Sources of the Hexateuch</u>, p. 172.

a wide variety of opinions among critics in the matter. That the chapter is composite is shown by v. 4b after v. 2, by the doublets in v. 3, by the variation in the location of Balaam's home in v. 5, and by the difficulty in placing v. 22 after vv. 20 and 21 because of the deity's change in attitude toward Balaam and the difference in the people who accompanied Balaam on the journey. The presence of the term אלהים and the verb נתן meaning permit suggests that in part the chapter is to be attributed to E. There is no consistency in the use of יהוה and אלהים, however, and an analysis can not be made on that basis. In vv. 5 and 11 the use of כסה את-עין הארץ,[1] suggests that at this point J may be present. If it is assumed for the minute that vv. 3a,4,5(omitting פתורה אשר על-הנהר), and 11 are J, it is necessary also to include v. 6 with the group, for it is presupposed by v. 11. Vv. 17 and 37 must also be included with them since they are referred to later in XXIV 11, a section which it is generally admitted does not belong with chapter XXIII, which is often assigned to E. Vv. 22-35 are then also often attributed to J, because they obviously differ from the story immediately preceding, and because the talking ass resembles the talking serpent of Gen. III, which by many critics is considered J. There are very great

1. This expression is found elsewhere only in Ex. X 5 and 15, verses which appear to belong to J; compare Gray, Numbers, p. 312.

difficulties, however, in assigning these verses, and a few others which are still more doubtful, to J and most of the rest of the chapter to E. In the first place it is to be noted that when such a separation is made, on both sides very fragmentary narratives are left in which highly important moments in the story have been omitted by the redactor in order to jump with little advantage to a different document. Further, the phraseology of v. 35 so closely resembles vv. 20 and 21 that it seems that the latter must have been written by the same hand as the former, or at least that the author of v. 35 must have been familiar with vv. 20 and 21. It has long been observed that the admission that there was a prophet of Yahweh among others than the people of Israel is most unexpected in the J and E documents. Such a story, including as it does the figure of the talking ass, reminds one strongly of the parable of the Book of Jonah, particularly when it is observed that the purpose of the story of the whale and that of the talking ass is in part to teach the same lesson, the impossibility of going counter to the will of Yahweh. Such a lesson is not very clear, it is true, in the present text, yet if the usual reconstruction[1] of the narrative which includes the story of the ass is correct, the presence of this didactic element in the

1. Cf. Baentsch, Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri, pp. 590,591, for example.

story is obvious. The poem in chapter XXIV is generally believed to be,in part at least, from as early a date as the J document, and it must have constituted a part of the strand which is under discussion, for throughout the story a blessing in the mouth of Balaam is demanded. Yet the fact that an early poem is imbedded in the narrative need not in itself indicate that the narrative surrounding it is early; the writer may well have had access to poems of the early days of his nation which he at a far later time found appropriate for use in his own production. In view of these numerous problems which appear in the story of Balaam it seems probable to the present writer that, whatever source or sources may be responsible for the narrative,no part of it belongs to J.

Numbers XXV

In this chapter three different stories can be distinguished. One belongs to the priestly writer and is found in v. 6 ff. The other two are found intermingled in vv. 1-5. To E is usually attributed vv. 1a,3, and 5, because of the use of ישׂראל instead of העם in those verses, and because of the mention of the judges, as in Ex. XVIII. In this narrative the people adopt the worship of a foreign god and have to be punished for it. In the remaining verses, 1b,2, and 4, the only evidence for determining what source is present is the use of העם, as

is frequently found in J but also often in the other documents. The subject-matter deals with the immoral association of the people with Moabitish women and the worship of their gods which was sure to follow. Such an interest is to be expected in the period of the deuteronomist, and is certainly expressed in a remarkably similar verse in Ex. XXXIV 15, which belongs to the deuteronomic portion of the chapter, according to Professor Pfeiffer.[1] It is not to be expected from J, however, in spite of his dislike of marriages with the Canaanites, as expressed in Gen. XXIV 3 and 37. It is therefore much to be doubted whether the Yahwistic source is represented in this chapter.

Numbers XXXII

This chapter is full of difficulties. In the first 38 verses there are three replies of the children of Gad and Reuben which say practically the same thing. Indications of deuteronomic work appear particularly in vv. 7-15, and 33. Also in the section are found indications of the presence of J and E; and scattered through the whole are phrases usually found only in P. Characteristic J phrases such as מצא חן, עבדיך, אדני, and מקנה are found in vv. 1,5, 16,25-27, and 31, which make it seem probable that a J basis exists; yet priestly and deuteronomic expressions

1. Pfeiffer, The Oldest Decalogue, JBL, 1924, p. 294 ff.

likewise are present, so that it is evident that there is no pure J text, and that the whole is the result of the work of several redactors. As these first thirty-eight verses present the story of the settlement in Gilead of the tribes Gad and Reuben so also vv. 39-42 present the story of the conquest of that country by a part of the tribe of Manasseh, although within that section is interpolated v. 40 denying that the conquest was the result of the independent action of that tribe. This section is so similar both in content and in form to the material in the latter part of Joshua and in Ju. I, which, it will be shown, constitute summaries of J material from the hand of a late editor, that it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that they have the same origin. The question must be raised concerning the relation of this material to that of the first part of the chapter. If these verses are a summary of a story that originally stood in J concerning the conquest of Gilead by a part of the tribe of Manasseh, are they parallel to the story in the first part of the chapter which told of the settlement of the children of Gad and Reuben in that region? And if so, must one of the other be eliminated from J? A consideration of Deut. III shows that the sources which the deuteronomistic writer of that chapter had before him contained two stories of these events side by side. One (cf. Deut. III 14) told of the conquest of Gilead by a portion of Manasseh, and the other (cf. Deut. III 16 ff.) told of the agreement between

Moses and the children of Gad and Reuben, as in the first part of Nu. XXXII. It is quite possible, therefore, that J included both stories in his narrative. The J material of vv. 1-38 stood at the present point in the epic. The J equivalent of vv. 39,41, and 42, however, may have been found originally in another location, for it seems to belong with the other stories of the conquest. It may be that it originally stood in connection with Jos. XVII 14-18, as Holzinger[1], in partial agreement with Budde[2], has argued. In that case it described how it came about that, after having settled at first with the rest of the tribes in the land of Canaan, part of Manasseh returned and established itself in the less fertile land on the east of the Jordan.

Deuteronomy XXXI

The chapter is composite and possibly some E may be recognized in vv. 14,15, and 23 because of the emphasis on Joshua and the אהל. In the rest of the chapter, however, deuteronomic phrases are numerous, so that, while it is not all unified, still it must be the work of the deuteronomic school. No J seems to be present.

Deuteronomy XXXIV

There is no certainty that J is present in this

1. Holzinger, Josua, p. 71.

2. Budde, Richter, p. 12 f.

chapter, but the fact that Moses did not reach Canaan is something that would have been of interest to all the narrators and probably was included in each source. Much deuteronomic and priestly work is evident. Although, however, v. 4 could equally well be attributed to either a deuteronomist or E, if J is to be found at all in this chapter it is probably to be sought here. Furthermore this verse contains the promise which was so dear to the J writer from the opening chapters of his work in Genesis consistently throughout his epic.

Joshua II

The difficulties which at best are very great in this chapter are increased by the fact that the LXX varies widely from the Masoretic text, so that it is not easy to determine whether some of the superfluous expressions are late glosses or whether they are due to conflation of sources. That E is present in the chapter is shown by the fact that the center from which the Israelites work is Shittim, as in Nu. XXV 1a. The hand of the deuteronomist is seen in vv. 10 and 11. The question then arises whether J is also present; and in this matter critics hold very divergent opinions. It may be said first that the narrative is vivid and interesting and is such as one might expect would attract the J writer. Furthermore there are a number of doublets and other passages where the narrative is uneven which suggest that another source is present.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

In v. 3 the phrase אשר באו אל־בית is superfluous, but it is lacking in the Peshitto, whether because it was not found in the manuscript which it was translating, or because the translator was attempting to make his text more smooth is uncertain. It is probably simply a variant reading, as is found elsewhere in the Old Testament,[1] and it is not to be used as evidence for the existence of an independent document. V. 4a, however, is a doublet of v. 6, and it appears that one verse or the other must be removed from the connection of the E document. When the vivid details of v. 6 are observed, as well as the fact that they resemble the excellent story of II Sam. XVII 15-22, a part of the old source of Samuel, it seems probable that at this point a fragment of J has been inserted in the E narrative. In vv. 8-24 also two strands of material are distinguishable. As Holzinger has said of v. 8a, it "ist im jetzigen Zusammenhang sinnlos."[2] By a textual emendation this difficulty might be avoided. If this clause were read והם טרם ישבון (and before they returned), with the pronoun making reference to the pursuers of the preceding verse, the whole verse would become comprehensible and a valuable part of the narrative. Since 8b refers to the hiding of the men on the roof, as was described before only in v. 6, this verse must constitute a part of the J document.

1. Cf. the variant reading in Ju. XI 31, where is found a similar use of a relative clause parallel to a participle with the definite article.

2. Holzinger, Josua, p. 4.

9a, a good sequel to it, is also from J, while 9b, which overloads the sentence and contains the difficult word נתן (in itself an item sufficient to cast suspicion on the authenticity of the J text at this point), is to be discarded as an addition of a later writer. V. 12abα continues the J section, as is shown by the phrase עשה חסד. 12bβ is from the parallel narrative of E, since it has in mind the line of scarlet thread of v. 18, the token which is given to Rahab for use in the time of siege. With this goes also v. 13, which forms a doublet to 12bα. 14 and 15abα continue the J narrative of 12abα. Note the expression ועשינו עמך חסד ואמת. 15bβ forms a doublet to 15bα and so is to be attributed to the other source. At this point the J narrative appears to break off, for it is difficult to suppose that when the woman had with the greatest secrecy lowered the men from her window she would then continue her conversation, shouting to them below. The remaining verses in the chapter, which tell of the giving of the piece of scarlet thread to Rahab for her protection, form a part of the E document. The E story has not been retained intact in the present chapter, but between v. 7 and v. 12bβ, and again between 13,15bβ, and 16, E material has been lost as a result of the conflation of sources. The result of the present investigation has been to show that the conquest of Jericho, although found in the present text in only fragmentary form, was described in the original J

document. A fragment in Jos. V 13-15, it will be found later, offers further confirmation of this decision.

Joshua III

No J is to be found in this chapter. E is probably present, and deuteronomic work is very prominent. An emphasis on the miraculous and on the ark of the covenant which the priests bore, is evident throughout the chapter -- features which are not to be found in any of the work of J.

Joshua IV

Although several hands have been at work on this chapter with great resulting confusion, none of the J document is to be found here. This section is a continuation of the preceding chapter, with the same emphasis on the miraculous, the ark of the covenant, and the priests which was noticed there. None of these elements are to be found in J.

Joshua V

In this chapter vv. 1,4-7 bear the characteristics of the deuteronomic writer. Vv. 2,3,8, and 9 are in large part, it seems probable, to be assigned to E, for the J document has already, in Ex. IV 24-26, given its account of the origin of circumcision. Vv. 10-12 are from P. In vv. 13-15 appears a fragmentary section which seems to be introductory to an account of the capture of Jericho which is now missing. The incident is very picturesque, and strikingly resembles earlier portions of the J narrative.

V. 13, for example, is very similar to the opening verses of Gen. XVIII. V. 15 also is very much like the J verse Ex. III 5. Against assigning these verses to J it is often remarked that the expression שר-צבא-יהוה is not to be expected before the time of Daniel. It is probable, however, that no such developed conception of angelic beings as this comment implies was in the mind of the author of this section. In J's mind the captain of the host of Yahweh was simply Yahweh's agent in communicating with the military leader Joshua, as the three visitors of Abraham in Gen. XVIII were spokesmen for the deity. In the background of the Yahwistic story, however, may be an ancient polytheistic legend in which Joshua was met and aided by the local divinity of the spot. As in Jos. II it seemed probable that a portion of the J document was preserved telling of Rahab's assistance in the spying out of Jericho, so in this section some material from the continuation of that story is to be found, a proof that, although little can now be recognized, the conquest of Jericho was originally narrated in the J document.

Joshua VI

That in this chapter much late material is present is shown by the references to the ark of the covenant and the priests. The only places where the presence of J material is at all possible are vv. 17,21-23, and 25,

where reference is made to the earlier story of Rahab and the spies. Even there, however, it seems more likely that a portion of E is present which has been reworked by a redactor.[1] Steuernagel has noted that v. 25 was "von dem pedantisch genauen R beigefügt, der bei v. 22 f, die Angabe vermisste, dass man Rahab und ihre Familie auch hinterher nicht etwa tötete." V. 23, if it also is not reworked, makes reference to the E verse of VI 13. Thus the little that is left of early material in this chapter is probably not from the J writer.

Joshua VII

In this chapter P can be recognized in at least v. 1; and the hand of the deuteronomist is also often present. E, however, forms the basis of the chapter, and into the E material it is possible that fragments of a J narrative have been inserted. In vv. 21-26, where the sin and punishment of Achan are described, the presence of J appears most probable. In v. 21b the change of number (in the first two words, והנם טמנים, the plural, while in the last word, תחתיה, the singular appears) gives clear evidence that the text has been tampered with. A difficult text is also found in v. 25. Three clauses in the second half of the verse give the punishment which was inflicted upon Achan. In the first of these all Israel takes part and the verb which is used for

1. Steuernagel, Josua, p. 174.

stoning is the favorite of P, רגם. The second supposes that the penalty was burning, as was mentioned earlier in the chapter in v. 15. The third again gives Achan's death as the result of stoning, but the verb is סקל, an expression of J, E, and also D. It is probable therefore that P, E, and J are all represented in the three clauses of 25b, and that the last is J is made more clear by the immediately following v. 26, which gives the etymology of the Valley of Achor introduced by the expression על-כן קרא שם, a favorite phrase of J. It thus seems probable that the story of the death of Achan was included in the J document; but that this was a part of a narrative of the fall of Ai, as in the present text, does not necessarily follow. The Valley of Achor lies close to Jericho, not Ai; and it is there that this incident takes place. The fragments which are left to us are so small in extent that it is impossible to tell what their original nature may have been. That a disaster of some sort befell the men of Israel is certain, but whether it was a military defeat, or possibly a plague that swept the camp, can not be determined. Since the story of the stratagem of the Gibeonites is the next section where a J narrative can be surely recognized, it would be more satisfactory, likewise, in a consideration of this chapter, to suppose that the location of the camp of the Israelites at that time was near Jericho rather than at Ai, for the latter city is too close to the town of the

Gibeonites to make the deception practised upon Israel, if they were living there, convincing.

Joshua VIII

In this chapter the hand of the deuteronomist is present, particularly in vv. 30-35, but also probably in other phrases scattered throughout the narrative. When this deuteronomic material has been removed, however, the narrative which is left appears to be composite. The numbers in v. 3, for example, are not in keeping with those in the later verse 12. V. 9b is a doublet of 13b. The spear in v. 18 has a miraculous power which is described further in v. 26, whereas in v. 19 it serves simply as a signal, but one which had not been referred to earlier when the arrangements for the battle had been made. V. 20b is repeated quite unnecessarily in 21. It is possible that vv. 1-10,14-18,20,22-29 contain a narrative which, if some deuteronomic additions and later glosses are removed, belongs to the E document. The exaggeration in the numbers in v. 3, the mention of the elders in v. 10, the interest in the miraculous spear, as previously in the miraculous rod of Moses, suggest that this assignment may be correct. According to this story the arrangement of the ambush is made at night, after which Joshua returns to the rest of the army ready to lead them forth from their usual camp when the morning appears. Vv. 11-13,19, and 21 present a

different, but apparently somewhat reworked narrative. According to this account not only is the ambush prepared under cover of night, but the whole line of battle is drawn up so that when morning comes the men of Ai find the Israelites ready to advance. The section must be abridged and revised, because v. 11 is far from smooth, and the arrangement according to which Joshua's extension of his hand should serve as a signal is not mentioned at all. Whether or not this strand of the narrative is J it is difficult to determine. The conservative number in v. 12, as well as the lack of the miraculous in this section, in contrast to the use of the spear on the part of E, might suggest that the J source was present. The fragments which are left of the story, however, are not sufficiently vivid and interesting, nor are there enough linguistic evidences of J in the section to make it at all certain that any of the original J document is left in the chapter.

Joshua IX

In this chapter the hand of P is evident in vv. 15b, 17-21,23b, and in at least part of 27. The work of the deuteronomist, likewise, is present in vv. 1,2,10, and 24. In the remaining verses there are also indications that the narrative is not unified. In a part of 6b and v. 7 it is the men of Israel rather than Joshua who carry on the negotiations with the strangers. Here also the strangers

are called Hivites instead of Gibeonites. In v. 14 it is the men again who conclude the hurried covenant with the strangers; and in v. 15a are found doublets. Furthermore vv. 25 and 26 appear to be an anticlimax after v. 23a. Of the two main strands of narrative which can thus be distinguished in the chapter, that which has the greater vividness and which makes frequent use of the word עבדך is probably to be attributed to the J document. The verses, then, which can with some probability be assigned to J are 4,5,8,9a,11-13,15aα,16*,22,23a. V. 3, however, with its retrospective glance at earlier successes of Israel, v. 6a, with its reference to the camp at Gilgal,which has not been mentioned in those sections which the present study of Joshua has attributed to the J document, and v. 9b, which is written in the same mood as v. 3, are verses which at times are associated with the strand at present under consideration. It seems, however, most unlikely that they form a part of J; instead they are the work of a redactor. Further support for the view that a part of the present chapter is J appears, however, if it is considered that the old source of the books of Samuel is J. The importance of the Gibeonites in the affairs of Saul and David was considerable. If, then, it should prove to be true that the author of both the Yahwistic material of the Hexateuch and of the early sections of Samuel is the same, a story

of the early relations between Israel and the Gibeonites would be natural in the J source.

Joshua X

In a consideration of this chapter it is commented by some critics that the continual references in the first fourteen verses to the story of the Gibeonites of the preceding chapter make it seem probable that some of this material is from J. That this chapter is a continuation of the second strand of that narrative, however, and thus is probably to be attributed to E instead of J seems most likely when it is observed that the five kings are called Amorites, as E likes to do, and that the emphasis on the miraculous in the chapter is so great. Indeed the whole chapter is full of exaggeration, as has not been found to be characteristic of J heretofore. The great size of the slaughter and the resulting lack of further opposition to the Israelites are again and again emphasized. It is for these reasons that the presence of J in the chapter is doubted by the present writer.

Joshua XI

This chapter, which is so similar to the preceding narrative, also seems to contain nothing from the J document. The complete destruction of all opposition to Israel is the dominant interest of the section, in contrast to J, who

of the model relations between Israel and the Hindmarsh media as defined in the f'ssorts.

Season 2

In a consideration of this question it is commonly by some critics that the dominant estimation of the first Hindmarsh season is the story of the "Sister Life" of Meg Spencelice character upon it seem possible that one of this material is Ivor f. That this character is a reminiscence of the second season of first negotiations, however, has been in probably to be attributed to a instead of a more likely when it is considered that the rate those the policies, as I liken it do, and that the movements of the alternatives in this character is so great. Indeed the whole character is full of transformation, as has not been found to be characteristic of a leadership. The great also of the character has the resulting lack of further opportunities in the discussions are really and equal encounters. It is not clear therefore that the presence of f in the character is motivated by the general action.

Season 3

This character, which is so similar to the previous narrative, also seems to contain nothing from the f manuscript. The vanishing reinstatement of air dependence to Israel in the national interest of the section, I mention in f, was

usually includes some human touches to make his narratives entertaining. The style here is concise and matter-of-fact and creates a very different impression from the usual vivid passages of J. It is therefore quite certain that J does not appear in this chapter.

Joshua XIII 13, XV 13-19,63, XVI 10, XVII 11-13,14-18, XIX 47, and Judges I 1- II 5.

In the preceding study of the first eleven chapters of Joshua it became apparent that some J was retained in the first part of Joshua, although only in fragmentary form. This account of the conquest concerned the taking of Jericho, the death of Achan in the Valley of Achor, and the deception of the Gibeonites. The narrative, however, was so mutilated that the details of the incidents could not be recovered. In the latter part of the Book of Joshua and in Ju. I 1-II 5 is found additional material consisting of summaries and isolated fragments of stories of the conquest which are generally believed to rest upon a J basis and to give great assistance in determining J's conception of the conquest. This material differs from the point of view presented by the greater part of Joshua in two ways: 1. the conquest is a gradual process, as a result of which the native peoples are only partially subdued and continue to live in the land in the midst of the invading Israelites; and 2. the Israelite tribes act independently, not as a unified body. It is

usually felt that J's authorship of these verses is well supported, since this picture of the conquest seems more reliable than that of E or P in Joshua, and J has been closer to historical facts heretofore.[1] Confirming evidence would also seem to be the apparently early date of this conception of the conquest, and the prominence of the southern tribes, whose traditions would be best known to a Judean writer. Within Ju. I, it is admitted, are found verses contradictory to the prevailing tenor of the chapter, as, for example, vv. 1a,8, and 18; and these are omitted as insertions of a later redactor. That the chapter in its greater part, however, is straightforward J material, taken directly from the J document, although placed in its present position by a later hand, is the universal opinion of critics. There are certain difficulties, however, with this point of view. In the first place there is an obvious difference between the style of these sections and that of the J material in the preceding books of the Hexateuch. Whereas in the patriarchal narratives, for instance, the stories were full of picturesque details set forth in a simple, flowing style, in these passages many incidents are given in summary form only, and when a brief glimpse is offered of some of the circumstances surrounding events, as in the story of Adoni-bezek, for example, the description

1. Cf. the stories of the plagues and the crossing of the sea.

is reduced to as brief a compass as possible, and the style is terse and compact to a high degree. In the second place, Ju. I 17 presents a story which is a parallel to that already told in Nu. XXI 1-3. To be sure, J's procedure in Gen. XII and XXVI would make it seem possible that he was responsible for two narratives presenting the etymology of Hormah. Yet because the two Genesis stories are not identical in the matter of characters, place, or time it is easier to understand how the author thought it appropriate to include them both in his epic than it is to understand how he should have felt it suitable to explain the naming of one city by two different events. Woven into the body of the material which is said to be J in Ju. I and the similar sections in Joshua there are also statements that definitely conflict with J conceptions which are known elsewhere. In Ju. I 3 it is supposed that the division of the land among the tribes has been definitely agreed upon. "Come up with me into my lot.....and I likewise will go with thee into thy lot." This conception of an apportionment of the land which is decided upon at the entrance of the Israelites into the country is found in E and P, but is in clear conflict with the later stories in Judges, and with the usual idea of J's presentation of the conquest; indeed it is probable that the early stories of the Book of Judges themselves formed a part of the J document. In Ju. I 16 the Kenites and men of Judah start their activity from

is reduced to an equal a concern to politics, and the style is here not compact to a high degree. In the second place, Ja. I II presents a story which is a variant of that already told in Ja. XXI 1-2. To be sure, the [illegible] in Ja. XXI and XXVI could make it seem probable that in any respectable [illegible] bar partridges resembling the [illegible] of [illegible]. But because the two Jamnia stories are not identical in the matter of numbers, place, or time it is hard to understand how the author thought it appropriate to include them both in his epic when it is so unnecessary to do so. Have just it subjects to regular [illegible] meaning of each story of two different events. Even this is not of the material which is said to be 4 in Ja. I and one similar passage in Jamnia story are also statements that particularly conflict with 2 conditions which are known elsewhere. In Ja. I 2 it is reported that the division of the land among the tribes has been [illegible] agreed upon. "Come up with me into my lot.....and I likewise will go with thee into the." This conception of an amalgamation of the land which is carried under is the difference of the [illegible] into the country is found in 2 and 3, but in other contexts which are later stories in Judges, and also the usual case of the conquest [illegible]: instead it is possible that the [illegible] of the Book of Judges [illegible] lumbering lumps a part of the J document. In Ja. I 16 the Kenites and men of Judah [illegible] [illegible] from

Jericho, as do all the tribes in the stories of E and P. In J, on the other hand, the spies are sent only into the south and the entrance to the country is made from that direction(Nu. XIII). In v. 28 of the same chapter the opposition to the people of the land is said to be from "Israel", not from some one of the tribes. Again in Jos. XIII 13 it is the "children of Israel" who are considered as a unit, although the verse presents the conquest as incomplete. And in Jos. XVII 14-18 it is Joshua who acts as the leader of the whole, and he is the one responsible for assigning lots to the tribes. It is also to be noted that the material has not been transmitted in fixed form. Jos. XV 13-19, for example, is a parallel account to Ju. I 10-15, and 20. There are, however, striking variations in the two in order and content. In the passage in Joshua Caleb is the chief actor throughout, while in Ju. I Judah is brought in at the beginning, as would be quite understandable from the hand of a later Judean enthusiast. Moore, on the basis of Jos. XV, which he considers the more original, reconstructs the passage in Ju. I as follows:[1] 20,10b(with the omission of)כ״ו),11-15. In the next parallel sections in Joshua and Ju. I -- Jos. XV 63 and Ju. I 21 -- it is Ju. I that has been retained in the most original form and Joshua that seems to have been

1. Moore, Judges, p. 22 ff.

corrupted. In Ju. I it is the children of Benjamin who were said to have been unsuccessful in their attempt to subdue the Jebusites in Jerusalem; in Jos. XV it is the children of Judah who made the unsuccessful attempt, as, at a later time, it was they under the leadership of David who tried again and at last succeeded. In both Jos. XVI 10 and Ju. I 29 the same ideas are presented in much the same words. Jos. XVI 10, however, is a somewhat longer passage, for here it is said that the Canaanites dwelt with the Ephraimites עד-הלום הזה and also that they served under tribute, a phrase which was used in the preceding verse (28) in Ju. I. Again in Jos. XVII 11-13 the same idea is expressed as is found in the parallel account in Ju. I 27 f., but somewhat different words are used. This is particularly noteworthy in Ju. I 28 and Jos. XVII 13. In Ju. I 28 it is Israel who became strong, put the Canaanites to tribute, but did not drive them out. In Jos. XVII 13 it is the בני ישראל who did so, but it is to be noticed that in the last phrase of the verse a recognition of the fact that this is a corrupted reading appears in the reversion of the verb to the singular -- והורש לא הורישו. The difficulties which have been presented here demand that the usual view of Ju. I and the similar passages in Joshua be revised. On the one hand the ideas of J are found, but on the other it does not seem to be the hand of J which is responsible

for the sections as we have them. It is probable that the material as it stands is a compilation of a late editor who condensed J material and arranged it in its present sequence, adding his corrections of J's point of view at such points as he felt it necessary. That this use of J material was made is particularly clear with reference to Jos. XIX 47. At this point chapters XVII and XVIII of Judges are summarized in one verse by a later editor. And acting on the suggestion which this verse of Jos. XIX gives, a consideration of Ju. I 4-7 and Jos. X is instructive. As in the patriarchal narratives E followed the J document step by step, correcting it where it conflicted with his own conceptions, so in the story of the conquest, it seems reasonable to suppose, the narratives of E were largely parallel to those of J, although they presented E's more developed conceptions. Then the Judges story of Adoni-bezek, which Moore believes is to be corrected to Adonizedek, is probably a brief summary of a narrative which once existed in J in the series which includes the story of Micah, the Levite, and the men of Dan. This E knew and modified to suit his own conceptions, producing the narrative of Jos. X. A late editor likewise was still familiar with the J account but he did not wish to preserve it intact, so he condensed it to a mere four verses and added it to the rest of the material of our present chapter. In a similar way,

it is easy to believe, Ju. I 22-26 arose. Here a story of the activity of the house of Joseph at Bethel is found whose similarity to the story in Jos. II of Rahab and the spies is striking. It seems probable that in the original J document it was the house of Joseph under Joshua (cf. Jos. V 13-15) who carried through the successful attack on Jericho, and that soon after that victory J told of a similar approach to Bethel, which city likewise was overcome as a result of the able work of spies. It is a portion of that narrative which is found in vv. 22-26 of Ju. I. The lateness of the compilation of Ju. I can be demonstrated in several different ways. It is clear that it was added to the deuteronomic books of Joshua and Judges for it breaks the obvious connection between Jos. XXIV 28 and Ju. II 6. In Jos. XXIV 28 we read "So Joshua let the people depart, every man unto his inheritance." In Ju. II 6 comes the immediate continuation of that statement, "And when Joshua had let the people go, the children of Israel went every man unto his inheritance to possess the land." Between the two has now been inserted the close of the Book of Joshua and Ju. I 1- II 5. But not only is Ju. I later than the deuteronomic material of Joshua and Judges, it is also later than the P material of Joshua. Vv. 29-33 of Jos. XXIV give P's story of Joshua's death; the opening verse of Ju. I begins "Now after the death of Joshua it came to pass". This phrase is the work of an editor, of course,

as critics have always realized; but it is the work of the editor whose hand is to be traced throughout the chapter in phrases which are woven into the fabric of the narrative -- phrases that presuppose the division of the land into definite allotments, references to the Perizzites as inhabitants of the land together with the Canaanites, in the assertion that Jerusalem was taken, and the belief that the tribes started their invasion of the country from the central point Jericho. It is likewise into a P background that the similar fragments in the latter part of the Book of Joshua have been inserted. What relation these bear to the sections in Ju. I it is difficult at present to determine. As has been pointed out above, now it is the material in Joshua that appears to be the more original, now it is the material in Ju. I. Therefore it comes to appear probable that both the fragments found in the latter part of the Book of Joshua and the material in Ju. I rest upon a summary of J stories of the conquest made by a third individual. These, with the several changes which seemed suitable to later editors, were added for the sake of completeness to the books of Joshua and Judges. The originals, however, with the single exception of the story of Micah and the Danites, were discarded because of their view of the conquest which conflicted with the orthodox theory. The divisions and only partially successful struggles of the individual tribes of Israel seemed

shameful and quite improbable to the men of the later day who lived when Judah was weak, poor, and divided. They looked back upon the foundation of their country as a Golden Age when the divisions and failures of their day were not present, and it was the view of E, in harmony with this idealization of the past that they preserved. The surprising fact in this whole situation is that the respect of these people for the past was strong enough so that even in its present mutilated form J's conceptions of the conquest of Palestine have been retained for us until the present day.

PART II

INTRODUCTION TO J

CHAPTER I

DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION

The place in which J was written is a subject on which variant views have been expressed. In favor of its origin in the northern kingdom are such scholars as B. Luther, Kuenen, and Schrader; while a very large number of critics hold the opposing view that J was written in the southern kingdom. Among the proponents of this latter theory are Ewald, Dillmann, Wellhausen, E. Meyer, Stade, Budde, Kittel, Driver, Holzinger, Gunkel, Baudissin, Cornill, Procksch, Sellin, and Brightman. A third theory has been proposed by Kautzsch.[1] The original Yahwistic source was written, he thinks, in the northern kingdom, as the first group of critics supposed. A secondary hand made revisions and additions to the original, this later workman coming from Judah.[2]

Various elements within the Yahwistic source would seem to support the first hypothesis. Among the most important of these is the preference tendered Rachel and her sons. In both J and E Rachel is Jacob's favorite wife, while Leah is hated (Gen. XXIX, XXX, XXXIII). Joseph and

1. Kautzsch, An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 38 f.

2. For a refutation of the theory on which Kautzsch is working, that J is the product of a school of writers, see Chapter III.

CHAPTER I

DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION

The place in which J was written is a subject on which various views have been expressed. In favor of the origin in the northern kingdom are such scholars as P. Cahier, Hempel, and Schroeder; while a very large number of critics hold the opposing view that J was written in the southern kingdom. Among the proponents of this latter theory are Budde, Dillmann, Wellhausen, E. Meyer, Stade, Budde, Kittel, Driver, Holzinger, Gunkel, Pentateuch, Cornill, Procksch, Sellin, and Eichrodt. A third theory has been proposed by Kautzsch.[1] The original Yahwistic source was written, he thinks, in the northern kingdom, as the first group of critics supposes. A secondary hand made revisions and additions to the original, this later work[2] coming from Judah.

Various elements within the Yahwistic source would seem to support the first hypothesis. Among the most important of these is the preference bestowed Rachel and her sons. In both J and E Rachel is Jacob's favorite wife, while Leah is hated (Gen. XXIX, XXX, XXXIII). Joseph and

1. Kautzsch, An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 30 f.

2. For a refutation of the theory on which Kautzsch is working, that J is the product of a school of writers, see Chapter III.

Benjamin are their father's most beloved sons (Gen. XXXVII, XLIII, XLIV), and the jealousy arising on that account among Leah's children is disastrous, for a time, to Joseph. Joseph's children, likewise, gain Jacob's special attention, and Ephraim receives the patriarch's blessing (Gen. XLVIII 13, 14, 17-19, 20*).

It is to be noticed, also, that the sanctuaries of the northern kingdom are mentioned frequently as legitimate shrines where the deity had appeared. Shechem, Bethel, and Ai are referred to in the opening chapter (Gen. XII); Bethel comes to prominence again when Jacob stops there for the night (Gen. XXVIII); and Penuel is the spot on the east of the Jordan where tradition said the deity encountered Jacob and changed his name to Israel (Gen. XXXII).

That Hosea made use of J is maintained by Kuenen as another proof that J's chief circulation was in the north.[1] It is to be questioned, however, whether allusions to passages in the Pentateuch are assuredly authentic in Hosea; or if they are, whether it can be proved that they are based on J rather than on oral tradition. And it should also be asked what greater proof of its northern origin Hosea offers than Amos IV 11 or Is. III 9 give that J was composed in the south.

1. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 249.

Benjamin are their father's most beloved sons (Gen. XXXVII, XLIII, XLIV), and the jealousy arising on that account among Leah's children is disastrous. For a time, Ya'aqob, Joseph's children, Ephraim, Gilead, Gain Israel's nominal ancestor, and Ephraim receives the patriarch's blessing (Gen. XLVIII 18, 19, 17-20, 20*).

It is to be noticed, also, that the ancestors of the northern kingdom are mentioned frequently as legitimate sources where the daily had appeared. Jacobus, Daniel, and Al are referred to in the opening chapter (Gen. III): Israel comes to Bethlehem again when Jacob stops there for the night (Gen. XXVIII); and Penuel is the spot on the east of the Jordan where tradition said the deity encountered Jacob and changed his name to Israel (Gen. XXXII).

That Ephraim made use of J is maintained by Kuenen as another proof that J's chief circulation was in the north.[1] It is to be questioned, however, whether allusions to sources in the Pentateuch are sufficiently authentic in Amos; or if they are, whether it can be proved that they are based on J rather than on oral tradition. And it should also be asked what greater proof of its northern origin Amos offers than does IV 11 or 12. III 9 give that J was composed in the south.

1. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. p. 348.

1.

To be sure, the center of gravity of the country was in the north as long as the Ephraimitic kingdom existed. There were found the most progressive ideas, since the north was most in contact with the outside world. The rise of an Amos, Isaiah, and Micah, however, is sufficient to show the capacity of Judah to produce thinkers of the caliber of J.

While it may be admitted, therefore, that many of the traditions of which J made use originated in the north, the home of the Rachel tribes, it is not necessary to conclude that J himself lived there. A southern background is indicated by numerous items of evidence. While J recounts the origin of some of the northern shrines he has a greater knowledge of stories connected with the south. Abraham enters Canaan, it is true, from the vicinity of Shechem (Gen. XII 6a); but he continues southward until he reaches Hebron (Gen. XIII 18), and there he makes his home and dwells (Gen. XVIII). In E, on the other hand, Beersheba, the place of pilgrimage of the northern kingdom, is the central abode of Abraham (Gen. XXI, XXII). Not only are the stories of the southern sanctuary Hebron recounted in J alone, but the narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah, towns situated near the Dead Sea, likewise appears only in that

1. Kuenen, The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 249.

To be sure, the center of gravity of the country was in the north so long as the Israelitic kingdom existed. There were found the most progressive ideas, since the north was most in contact with the outside world. The rise of Gaza, Tamkan, and Ekron, however, is sufficient to show the capacity of Judah to produce thinkers of the caliber of J.

While it may be admitted, therefore, that many of the traditions of which J made use originated in the north, the home of the Israel tribes, it is not necessary to conclude that J himself lived there. A southern background is indicated by numerous items of evidence. While J recounts the origin of some of the northern sanctuaries he has a greater knowledge of stories connected with the south. Abraham enters Canaan, it is true, from the vicinity of Shechem (Gen. XII 6a); but he continues southward until he reaches Bethel (Gen. XIII 18), and there he makes his home and dwells (Gen. XVIII). In R, on the other hand, Beersheba, the place of pilgrimage of the northern kingdom, is the central abode of Abraham (Gen. XXI, XXII). Not only are the stories of the northern sanctuary Bethel recounted in J alone, but the narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah, towns situated near the Dead Sea, likewise appears only in that

1. Kamen, The Origin and Composition of the Pentateuch, p. 245.

source (Gen. XIX 1-28).[1] J believes the land was entered from the south (Nu. XIII); E, however, records that this was prevented by Edom (Nu. XX 14-21). That J knew numerous stories connected with the southern conquest the editor's work in Joshua and Judges I gives ample evidence. In the wilderness wanderings and during the period of conquest E's national hero, Joshua, takes a subordinate place. So slight is his role in any of the narratives that some critics believe him to be omitted entirely by J.[2] On the other hand, Caleb assumes an important place in J (Nu. XIII and Ju. I).

Not only is J more familiar with southern tradition than he is with stories about the north, but he shows partiality for that portion of the country. Whereas in E Reuben, the first-born, is the natural leader of Jacob's sons, in J Judah assumes that position. He defends Joseph and prevents the others from murdering him (Gen. XXXVII). He assumes the responsibility for Benjamin's safety (Gen. XLIII). It is he, likewise, in the presence of

1. Scholars usually make use of Gen. XXXVIII to support further the theory that J was particularly familiar with southern tradition. In view of the fact that the present writer rejects that chapter from the J source such an argument is necessarily omitted in the consideration of the subject.

2. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 352. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 82.

source (Gen. XIX 1-[illegible]). J believes the lawn was entered from the south (Gen. XXIX); E, however, reports that this was prevented by Zeus (Gen. XX 14-21). That J knew concerning stories connected with the southern nomadic tribes in Joshua and Judges I gives ample evidence. In the wilderness wanderings and during the period of conquest, J's national hero, Joshua, takes a subordinate place. So slight is his role in any of the narratives that some critics believe him to be added entirely by J.[2] On the other hand, Caleb assumes an important place in J (Gen. XIII and Ex. I).

Yet only in J were familiar with southern traditions does he in with stories about the north, but he shows partiality for that portion of the country. Thereon in E Reuben, the first-born, is the natural leader of Jacob's sons, in J Judah assumes that position. He defends Joseph and prevents the others from murdering him (Gen. XXXVII). He assumes the responsibility for Benjamin's safety (Gen. XLIII). It is as, likewise, in the episode of

1. Scholars usually make use of Gen. XXXVIII to support further the theory that J was particularly familiar with southern tradition. In view of the fact that the present writer rejects that chapter from the J source risk up arguments is necessarily omitted in the consideration of the subject.

2. Burgmeier and Barfoot, The Composition of the Pentateuch, p. 366. Holzinger, Einleitung, p. 82.

Joseph who offers his own life that Benjamin may be returned to his father.(Gen. XLIV).

That J's home was in the south is also indicated by his vagueness in regard to the Arameans. From them he insisted that his people came. Abraham's kindred, Rebekah, Leah, and Rachel were all Arameans(Gen. XXIV, XXVII 43, XXIX, XXXI); and when Abraham's servant and Jacob desired to visit these people they found them in Haran, a city of Mesopotamia, seven days' journey from the land of Canaan (Gen. XXIV, XXVII 43, XXVIII 10, XXIX, XXXI). The life in that city J did not understand, for he pictured a rural community whose activity centered in the well of the village to which all the flocks were brought, and around which were extensive fields wherein Jacob could pasture his sheep while Laban's brothers took theirs a three days' journey away.[1] On the other hand, since E lived in the north he knew that the Arameans were close at hand. His people had had many experiences with their eastern neighbors, and he consequently did not place them beyond the Euphrates, but he described them as "the sons of the east" (Gen. XXIX 1) living a pastoral life close by Canaan.

An intensity of hatred for Edom is found in J which adds further evidence that this author is from the south.

1. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 242 ff.

Joseph who offers his own life that Benjamin may be returned to his father.(Gen. XLIV).

That J's home was in the south is also indicated by his vagueness in regard to the Arameans. From them he insisted that his people came. Abraham's kinsfolk, Rebekah, Leah, and Rachel were all Aramean(Gen. XXIV, XXVII 43, XXIX, XXXI); and when Abraham's servant and Jacob decided to visit these people they found them in Haran, a city of Mesopotamia, seven days' journey from the land of Canaan (Gen. XXIV, XXVII 43. XXVIII 10, XXIX, XXXI). The life in that city J did not understand, for he pictured a rural community whose activity centered in the well of the village to which all the flocks were brought, and around which were extensive fields wherein Jacob could venture his sheep while Laban's brothers took theirs a three days' journey away.[1] On the other hand, since E lived in the northside knew that the Aramean were close at hand. His people had many experiences with their eastern neighbors, and he consequently did not place them beyond the Euphrates. Nor he described them as "the land of the east" (Gen. XXIX 1) living a pastoral life close by Canaan.

An intensity of hatred for Edom is found in J which adds further evidence that this author is from the south.

1. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 342 ff.

In both J and E the admission is made that Esau-Edom is older than Jacob-Israel, and a vigorous attempt is made to prove that this does not ipso facto guarantee his greater significance and power. To this task, however, J devotes himself with a greater depth of feeling than does E. In Gen. XXV 21-34 J speaks disparagingly of Esau as an improvident hunter, while Jacob, he says, lived the kind of semi-nomadic life which was his ideal. Esau is shown to be such a fool that he would sell his birthright for a mere bowl of lentil soup. From this stupid but vengeful brother Jacob is forced to flee after he has stolen his father's blessing (Gen. XXVII), and only his skilfulness on his return to Canaan at length allays Esau's smoldering anger (Gen. XXXIII). Such a dislike of a brother nation is understandable in a man from Judah, which had had many bitter experiences with the people on the south. E, on the other hand, shows no love for the Edomites, but he does not attack Esau with the scorn which is seen persistently in the work of J.

The date of J, more than the place in which the epic was written, is a question on which opinions vary. Two views divide the majority of Pentateuchal critics: ca. 850[1] is accepted by the greater number of scholars; the tenth century, however, seems the more probable date

1. Brightman, Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 30.

In both I and E the admission is made that Sean-Eoin is older than Jacob-Israel, and a vigorous attempt is made to prove that this does not imply greater maturity, greater significance and power. In this task, however, I deserves dismaid with a greater degree of feeling than does E. In Act. XIV (I-24) I speaks disparingly of Sean as an insignificant farmer, while Jacob, he says, lived the kind of semi-nomadic life which was his lot. Mass is shown by he such a fool that he would sell his birthright for a mess of pottage of lentil soup. From this simple but vengeful another Jacob is forced to flee after he has stolen his father's blessing (Gen. XXVII), and only his activities on his return to Tuscan at length utilize Sean's productive energy (Gen. XXXVII). Such a dislike of a brother motive is understandable in a man from Tuscan, which has had many bitter experiences with the people on the north. E, on the other hand, shows no love for the Lowlands, but he does not attack them with the scorn which is seen particularly in the work of I.

The main of I, more than the place in which the epic was written, is a question on which opinions vary. Two views divide the majority of Ballybeggan critics: (a. SBO is accepted by the greater number of the plays; the Tuscan critics), however, seems the more probable one

1. Pritchard, Journey of the Prentices, p. 30.

to Procksch[1] and Sellin[2].

In forming a decision in the matter, external evidence offers little assistance. Because of J's lack of acquaintance with the greatest contributions of the reform prophets it is certain that he precedes them by some years. He never forgets that Yahweh is a national god. His interest in morality does not interfere with this opinion. Phrases within the writings of the reform prophets showing a knowledge of traditions transmitted by J do not, however, prove a familiarity of these religious enthusiasts with J. If the allusions are authentic portions of the text, which is not at all certain, they still may refer merely to popular oral traditions. As Addis says, "Here[3], no doubt, we have allusions which prove that certain legends were current in the eighth century B.C., and were familiar both to Amos and to the early historians. We have no warrant for any further inference."

The difficulty in reaching a decision on the date of J is increased by the lack of agreement on the extent of the document. Internal evidence must be relied on entirely, as has been said in the preceding paragraph, and many of the passages in the text which seem to furnish criteria for a decision are of doubtful authenticity. The Urgeschichte is usually considered important for this purpose, but it is very

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 286.

2. Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 56.

3. Addis, The Documents of the Hexateuch, vol. I, p. lxxx.

to Proclaim and Salith.[1] [2]

In forming a decision in the matter, external evidence offers little satisfaction. Because of Jim's lack of acquaintance with the practical conditions of the reform prophets it is certain that he preceded them by some years. He never forgets that Yahweh is a national god. His interest in morality does not interfere with his opinion. Phrases within the vicinity of the reform prophets showing a knowledge of traditions transmitted by J do not, however, prove a familiarity of these religious communities with J. If the allusions are authentic portions of the text, which is not at all certain, they still may refer merely to popular oral traditions. As Adkis says, "Here, no doubt, we have allusions[3] which prove that certain legends were current in the eighth century B.C., and were familiar both to Amos and to the early historians. We have no warrant for any further inference."

The difficulty in reaching a decision on the date of J is increased by the lack of agreement on the extent of the document. Internal evidence must be relied on entirely, as has been said in the preceding paragraph, and many of the passages in the text which seem to furnish criteria for a decision are of doubtful authenticity. The Ugaschichte is usually considered important for this purpose, but it is very

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 588.
2. Smith, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 66.
3. Adkis, The Documents of the Hexateuch, vol. I, p. lxxx.

different in style, mood, and religion[1] from J and is not to be considered a part of that document. Neither can Gen. XXXVI offer assistance at this point, since the study of Part I seemed decisive in excluding it from J. Gen. XLIX, the Blessing of Jacob, is a very early poem, but it cannot be used to provide a terminus a quo for J, as is often done, if the results of the present investigation in rejecting it from J are correct.[2] The same is to be said of Nu. XXIV. It is a valuable early poem, but it comes from a different source than J.

It is possible, after the exclusion of these sections, to set extreme limits for the date of J. The terminus ad quem will be the great prophets, as has been said in an earlier paragraph of this chapter. This is not because of any assured acquaintance of the later religious leaders with J, but because their transformed conception of Yahweh is unknown to the Yahwistic writer. The terminus a quo will be the period of the united monarchy. Only with the establishment of the people in the land of Canaan, and with the formation of the national entity which was the work of David, could an assembling of national traditions be made, so surging with patriotic pride and fervor.[3]

1. Cf. Chapter III.

2. Cf. Chapter IV.

3. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 191. Cornill, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, p. 76.

difference in style, mood, and religion from 1 and is not to be considered a part of that document. Neither can Gen. XXXVI offer assistance at this point, since the study of Part I showed decisive in excluding it from 1. Gen. XIII, the dividing of lands, is a very early poem, but it cannot be used to provide a terminus a quo for 1, as is often done, if the results of the present investigation in rejecting it from 1 are correct. The same is to be said of Nu. XXIV. It is a variable early poem, and it comes from a different source than 1.

It is possible, after the exclusion of these sections, to set extreme limits for the date of 1. The terminus ad quem will be the great prophets, as has been said in the earlier paragraph of this chapter. This is not because of any assured acquaintance of the later religious leaders with 1, but because their transformed conception of Yahweh is unknown to the Yahwistic writer. The terminus a quo will be the period of the United Monarchy. Only with the existence of the people in the land of Canaan, and with the formation of the national society which was the seed of Israel, could any attempting of national conditions be made, so coming with patriotic pride and fervor.

1. Cf. Chapter III.

2. Cf. Chapter IV.

3. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 121. Cornill, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, p. 15.

Certain points in the content of J assist in a closer determination of the date. Gen. XXV 23 presupposes the reduction of Edom to subservience to Israel for which David was responsible (II Sam. VIII 13,14). An allusion to a later attempt of Edom to gain its freedom, in Gen. XXVII 40, does not necessarily fix the date as late as the time of Joram (II Kgs. VIII 20). In the first place, the origin of Gen. XXVII 40 is uncertain; Sellin[1] considers it a gloss. And furthermore, Procksch[2], who considers the verse authentic, believes that it refers to Solomon's trouble with Edom.

No assistance can be gained from the character of the language[3]. It resembles the best of the Hebrew classics--the old material of Judges and Samuel, for example. It is impossible to find proofs of great antiquity, however. Instances of archaic case endings and similar old grammatical constructions are too infrequent to be significant.

The mood of optimism pervading the whole proves it to originate from a time of peace and prosperity. Two periods in the history of Judah offer a situation which would be suitable for J in this respect. The earlier period is that of Solomon's reign of splendor; the later is the reign of Jehoshaphat. Between these two possibilities no fixed

1. Sellin, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 57.
2. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 289.
3. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 125.

Gertrude points to the content of I results in a closer determination of the date. Gen. XXV 34 presupposes the possession of Edom by subservience to Israel for which David was responsible (II Sam. VIII 12,14). An allusion to a later attempt of Edom to gain its freedom, in Gen. XXVII 40, does not necessarily fix the date on late as the time of Josiah (II Kgs. VIII 20). In the first place, the origin of Gen. XXVII 40 is debatable; Smith[1] considers it a gloss, and Gunkel[2], Procksch, who considers the verse authentic, believes that it refers to Solomon's trouble with Edom.

No distinction can be gained from the character of the language.[3] It resembles the best of the Hebrew classics--the old material of Judges and Samuel, for example. It is impossible to find proofs of great antiquity. However, Discussions of Gunkel's late analysis and similar old pre-exilic constructions are too infrequent to be significant.

The mood of optimism permeating the whole proves it to originate from a time of peace and prosperity. Two periods in the history of Judah offer a situation which would be suitable for it in this respect. The earlier period is that of Solomon's reign of splendor; the latter is the reign of Jeroboam. Between these two possibilities lies no fixed

1. Smith, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 57.

2. Gunkel, Die Genesis, p. 329.

3. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 126.

decision can be reached. A very powerful argument in favor of the ninth century is the resemblance of J's ideals for a ritualless worship of Yahweh to the teachings of the eighth century prophets. The closer J is to these prophets in point of time the more comprehensible are his views in regard to sacrifice and other religious practices. Very convincing arguments, however, support a date in the tenth century. As Procksch and Sellin[1] point out, there is no hint of the division of the kingdom. Such a negative argument is not of great significance, however, since E, who certainly comes from the time of the divided kingdom, makes as little reference to it as J. More important is the recognition of the vast difference between the prosperity of Judah in these two centuries. In the time of Jehoshaphat the southern kingdom was practically in a state of subservience to Israel. The marriage of Jehoshaphat to Ahab's daughter had brought peace between the peoples, but at the expense of dependence of Judah on Israel. This dependence likewise resulted for the kingdom in an entanglement in Israel's wars with the Syrians (I Kgs. XXII). There was no occasion, therefore, for the rise of an optimistic view of the future in this particular part of the history of Judah. The pride in their nation and confidence in its destiny would have to be a survival of the memories of Solomon's regime. If the epic was written, however, in the earlier time, the splendors which appeared so brilliant on the

1. Procksch, op. cit., p. 289. Sellin, op. cit., p. 56.

division can be reached. A very powerful argument in favor of the ninth century is the resemblance of its temple to a strikingly uniqueness of towers to the temples of the eighth century prophets. The closer J is in time chronologically point of view the more contemporaneous are his views in regard to sacrifice and other religious practices. Very convincing arguments, however, support a date in the tenth century. As Fronsac and Sellin point out[1], there is no mention of the division of the kingdom. Even a negative argument is not of great significance, however, since K. who certainly comes from the time of the divided kingdom, makes as little reference to it as J. More important is the recognition of the vast difference between the prosperity of Judah in these two centuries. In the time of Jehoshaphat the southern kingdom was practically in a state of subservience to Israel. The marriage of Jehoshaphat to Ahab's daughter had brought peace between the peoples, but at the expense of dependence of Judah on Israel. This dependence likewise resulted for the kingdom in an entanglement in Israel's wars with the Syrians (I Kgs. XXII). There was no cooperation, therefore, for the time of an optimistic view of the future in this particular part of the history of Judah. The great in trade ration and confidence in its destiny would have to be a survival of the memories of Solomon's reigns. If the epic was written, however, in the earlier time, the splendors which appeared so brilliant on the

1. Fronsac, op. cit., p. 58. Sellin, op. cit., p. 56.

surface of Solomon's reign would furnish a very suitable background in the midst of which the ideas of J could germinate and grow. In this early period the nation sought to make itself felt to the ends of the civilized world. International alliances attempted to make Israel's position assured. Building enterprises emulated the projects of the greater surrounding nations. In the midst of the accumulated wealth and the luxury of the royal court literature was cultivated, as the early stories of Judges and the oldest source of the books of Samuel show. How naturally in such circumstances a man like J might have arisen, inspired to present in imperishable form an epic of the origin, history, and future promise of his glorious nation.

The unsuitability of Jehoshaphat's reign for the origin of J becomes somewhat clearer when the interest of the epic in northern tradition is fully recognized. The stories of Bethel (Gen. XII 8, XXVIII), Shechem (Gen. XII 6), and Penuel (Gen. XXXII), the preference of the tradition for Rachel rather than Leah (Gen. XXIX, XXXIII), the partiality always evident for Joseph and Benjamin (Gen. XXXVII, XLIII, XLIV), and the special blessing which Jacob bestows on Ephraim (Gen. XLVIII) are indicative of the respect and good will which this southern writer bears the north. In the time of Jehoshaphat it would have been difficult for a loyal Judean such as was J to record with this utter lack of bitterness the superiority of the northerners to whom his people were in reality subservient.

surface of Solomon's reign would furnish a very plausible hook-
ground to the midst of which the lawn of a Doric gymnasia and
stoa. In this study period the nation sought to make itself
felt to the world of the civilized world. International alli-
ances strengthened to make Israel's position secured. Building
undertakings emulated the projects of the greater surrounding
nations. In the midst of the accumulated wealth and the luxury
of the royal court literature was cultivated, as the gaudy
annals of Judges and the chosen scenes of the house of Samuel
show. Now naturally in such circumstances a man like J might
have arisen, inspired to present in impressively form an epic
of the origin, history, and future promise of his glorious
nation.

The unavoidability of Jahwehnist's reign for the origin
of J becomes somewhat clearer when the theories of the epic in
northern tradition is fully recognized. The stories of Samuel
(Gen. XII 5, DCVIII), Shechem (Gen. XIV 9), and Penuel (Gen.
XXXII), the preference of the tradition for Samuel rather than
Saul (Gen. XIIX, CXXIII), the partiality Amos evidence for
Joseph and Benjamin (Gen. DCVXII, XLIII, XLIV), and the special
blessing which Jacob bestows on Judah (Gen. XLVIII) are
indicative of the respect and good will which this northern
writer bears the north. In the time of Jehoshaphat it would
have been difficult for a loyal Judean such as was J to record
with this utter lack of bitterness the supremacy of the
northerners to whom his people were in reality subservient.

Furthermore, the limitations in J's knowledge of the Arameans, which have been mentioned in an earlier paragraph of of this chapter, would seem surprising in a Judean of Jehoshaphat's time, since this ruler had been obliged to assist Ahab in combating them. On the other hand, the Arameans were of little importance in the affairs of either Ephraim or Judah in the earlier period of Solomon's reign. National events had not occurred to inform the people about these neighbors, and uncertainty concerning their location and manner of living would be expected in a man living in the south.

If it were possible to feel assured, as some critics are beginning to believe, that J is the author also of the early material in Judges and Samuel, a date from Solomon's reign would be a necessary conclusion. On the basis of linguistic evidence and similarity of ideas and style Theodor Klaehn, in a dissertation[1] published in 1914, has tried to establish identity of authorship for these sections. Further investigation should be made on the basis of a more accurately determined J and a fresh separation of early from late material in the books of Judges and Samuel. Until that is completed an open mind will have to be kept on the subject, although it seems to the present writer that the balance of evidence favors an early date.

1. Klaehn, Die sprachliche Verwandtschaft der Quelle K der Samuelisbücher mit der Quelle J des Heptateuch.

Furthermore, the interbedding in J's knowledge of the Aramaeans, which have been mentioned in an earlier paragraph of this chapter, would seem suggesting in a lapse of immemorial time, since full scribes had been called on assist Amos in composing them. On the other hand, the Aramaeans were of little importance in the affairs of either Ephraim or Judah in the earlier period of Solomon's reign. National events had not occurred to inform the people about these neighbors, and necessarily concerning their location and manner of living would be expected in a man living in the south.

If it were possible to feel assured, as some critics are beginning to believe, that J is the author also of the early material in Judges and Samuel, a date from Solomon's reign would be a necessary conclusion. On the basis of linguistic evidence and similarity of ideas and style Theodor Nöldeke, in a dissertation published in 1869,[1] was led to establish identity of authorship for these sections. Further investigation should be made on the basis of a more accurately determined J and a fresh separation of early from late material in the books of Judges and Samuel. Until this is completed an open mind will have to be kept on the subject, although it seems to the present writer that the balance of evidence favors an early date.

1. Nöldeke, Die semitischen Sprachwissenschaft und Zeitschrift für der Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft.

CHAPTER II

A COMPARISON OF J AND E

The attempt of the previous investigation to discover the original J document has called attention repeatedly to the distinctions which exist between that document and E, sources which are very closely united throughout the Hexateuch. It will be helpful, therefore, before proceeding further with the discussion of J to compare more fully the aspects of each source which make it possible for the critic to distinguish them, and which, furthermore, were the factors which made each document significant in the life of its time.

Many of the characteristic differences in the two sources are a result of the place in which each document had its origin. J, as has been said in Chapter I, came from the south, the home of the people of Judah; and he emphasized in his epic, tradition which had its center in the southern sanctuaries as well as tradition which was of interest to all the people of Israel. On the other hand, E had his home in the north and naturally presented the stories which were current in the sanctuaries which were of most importance to the people with whom he lived. Bethel was the foremost shrine of the northern kingdom; and it was E who presented the distinctive stories of that sanctuary, the story of Jacob's dream in Gen. XXVIII,

and in Gen. XXXV the account of the death of Deborah whose grave was located there, as well as the story of the erection and consecration of the famous altar and mazzebah which were to be found also in that spot. Likewise Beersheba, an important sanctuary for pilgrimages from the northern kingdom, is the home of Abraham in E rather than the distinctively southern center Hebron, as is told in the J document (Gen. XIII and XVIII); it is to Beersheba that the patriarch Jacob went at his departure to join Joseph in Egypt in order that he might offer sacrifice there to his god; and it was there that he received the vision which sanctioned his departure from the land of Canaan (Gen. XLVI 1f.). It was the heroes who had been of particular importance to the northern kingdom that E presented in the foremost place in the epic. For example, the grave of Rachel, the mother of the northern tribes, is mentioned only in E (Gen. XXXV 16-20). Likewise it is E, not J, who knows of the burial of Joseph in the land (Gen. L 25, Ex. XIII 19), although both authors recognize Joseph's importance in the development of the people Israel. Furthermore, throughout the story of the life of the people in the wilderness and later when they are attempting to force an entrance into Canaan, the Ephraimitic hero Joshua assumes an importance in the E narrative which very probably is out of all proportion to historical facts, since the corresponding account in J

and in vain. Only the account of the death of Deborah whose grave was located there, as well as the story of the erection and consecration of the famous altar and massebah which were to be found also in that spot.

Likewise Genesis, an important repository for plutologues from the northern kingdom. In the book of Amos in 3 rather than the distinctively southern centre Bethel, as it will in the J document (Gen. XIII and XVIII); it is to forecast that the patriarch Jacob went at his ancestors to join Joseph in Egypt in order that he might offer sacrifice there to his god; and it was there that he received the vision which sanctioned his departure from the land of Canaan (Gen. XLVI 1-4). It was the person who had been of particular importance to the northern kingdom that E presented in the foremost place in the epic. The example, the giver of Hosea, the mother of the northern nation. Is mentioned only in E (Gen. XXIV 16-20). Likewise it is E, not J, who knows of the burial of Joseph in the land (Gen. L 25, Ex. XIII 19), although both authors recognize Joseph's importance in the development of the people Israel. Furthermore, E conceives the story of the life of the people in the wilderness and later when they are allowing to force or entrance into Canaan, the Tyrwhitt here Joshua assumes a importance in his E narrative which very probably is out of all proportion to historical facts, since the corresponding account in J

assigns to him so small a place that very many critics[1] are in doubt whether Joshua is mentioned at all in the J document. In a similar way Judah, the father of J's tribe, is emphasized in the southern source. This emphasis on the part of J appears often, but particularly clearly in Judah's prominence in the Joseph stories, whereas in the same places in the Joseph stories E retains what was evidently an earlier tradition, since he gives the leadership among the brothers to the first-born of Jacob, Reuben. In correspondence with what would seem to have been true of the tribes in the two sections of the country respectively, the southern source describes the entrance of the people into the land as from the south in the direction of Hebron,[2] and the northern source, far from thinking that such was the course of events, affirms that the hostility of the Edomites prevented such a route, and the tribes came from the east across the Jordan.[3] A further difference between the two sources may also be accounted for by the difference in the place from which they originated. J, who lived in the south of Palestine, at a considerable distance from the Arameans, thought

1. Carpenter and Harford, Composition of the Hexateuch, p.352. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 82.

2. Cf. Nu. XIII.

3. Cf. Nu. XX 14-21 and the following E passages in Numbers and Joshua.

analogue to him on small a place that very many critics are in some measure doubtful in maintaining it all in the [illegible] movement. In a similar way Tudor, the father of the tribe, is regarded in the commentaries. This [illegible] depends on the fact of [illegible] drift, but particularly clearly in Tudor's appearance in the Lucan stories, where in the same phrase in the Lucan stories a relation must say bitterly to certain irritation, since he gives the lamentable among the brothers in the first-born of Tudor, Rhuddu. In correspondence with what would seem to have been true of the tribes in the two sections of the country respectively, the southern source learns the entrance of the people into the land as from the south in the direction of Dorcon, and the northern source from their landing last such was the course of events, [illegible] that the possibility of the Tudorian provinces must [illegible] and the tribes came from the east across the [illegible].

A further difference between the two sources can also be assumed for in the difference in the place from which they originated. [illegible], who lived in the south of Britain as a consequently distance from the Armorica, thought

1. Carpenter and Fortrey, Pronunciation of the Frankish. p. [illegible]. Mutzbauer. Germanen. p. [illegible].

2. Cf. Vn. XIII.

3. Cf. Vn. Cf. [illegible] and the following 3 passages in Tudors and Tudors.

with pride of the origin of his people from this great group of his day. Yet he was not well informed concerning the location of these people, for he placed them in Haran, in Mesopotamia. And when he described the life of the Mesopotamian city he failed to realize what its real conditions must have been. Instead of the buildings, markets, and squares of a populous town he pictured a nomadic people pasturing their sheep around a well in the midst of a field[1] (Gen. XXIV and XXIX). And when Jacob fled from Laban to return to his home the distance between Haran and Canaan was not understood by J, but he assumed that even with his flocks seven days were sufficient for Jacob's journey[2] (Gen. XXXI). The E author, on the other hand, was well acquainted with the Arameans who were very near his people and were causing great trouble for the nation in his day; and he described the home of Laban as among the "sons of the east" (Gen. XXIX 1), a much more accurate location than is to be found in the earlier author from the south.[3]

As important for an understanding of the differences in the two documents as the place in which each was written is the date of their origin. J, as has been said in Chapter

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 293.
2. Procksch, Genesis, p. 186f.
3. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 242 f.

with pride of the origin of his people from this great
young of his war. Yet he was not well informed concern-
ing the location of these people, for he placed them in
Aerus, in Mesopotamia. And when he described the life
of the Mesopotamian city he failed to realize what its real
conditions must have been. Instead of the buildings,
markets, and squares of a populous town he pictured a
nomadic people pasturing their sheep around a well in the
midst of a field (Gen. XXIV and XXIX).[1] And when Jacob
fled from Laban to return to his home the distance between
these two Canaan was not understood by J, but he assumed
that even with his flocks seven days were sufficient for
Jacob's journey (Gen. XXXI).[2] The E author, on the other
hand, was well acquainted with the Aramaens who were very
near his people and were causing great trouble for the
nation in his day; and he described the home of Laban as
among the "sons of the east" (Gen. XXIX 1). A much more
accurate location then is to be found in the earlier
author from the south.[3]

As important for an understanding of the differences
in the two documents as the place in which each was written
is the date of their origin. J, as has been said in Chapter

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 265.
2. Procksch, Genesis, p. 1887.
3. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 242 f.

I, in all probability is to be assigned to the time of prosperity and optimism of the reign of Solomon -- thus the tenth century B.C. The two centuries following brought big changes in the life of the people, many of which are reflected in the E document. Whereas in J there is no mention of the author's acquaintance with the prophetic movement, in E in several places[1] some of the characters are called prophets. It is possible that not all of these passages are from the original document, but it is difficult to exclude them all as material from a secondary strand of E. That E would have been acquainted with prophecy seems probable because of his home in the north where our biblical evidence seems to show that prophecy had its origin.[2] The prophetic movement, however, does not seem to have reached its height at the time of E, since the high places are still held in great honor, and worship at them is not yet considered to be offensive to Yahweh, as came about from the influence of Hosea. Furthermore, the priests were the respected men of the author's day since it is as a priest that E has described the founder of the nation, Moses.[3]

1. Gen. XX 7, Ex. XV 20, Nu. XI 25-29, XII, XXII, XXIII.

2. Cf. I Sam. IX, the narratives of Elijah and Elisha in the books of Kings, I Kgs. XXII, the work of Amos in Israel, and Hosea.

3. Hölscher, Die Profeten, p. 109 f.

I. In all probability it is to be assigned to the time of prosperity and splendor of the reign of Solomon -- thus the tenth century B.C. The two centuries following brought big changes in the life of the people, many of which are reflected in the I Isaiah. Whereas in J there is no mention of the author's sympathetic with the prophetic movement, in I in several places some of the characters are called prophets. It is possible that not all of these passages are from the original document, but it is difficult to exclude them all as material from a secondary stratum of I. And I would have been associated with prophecy some probable because of his fame in the north where our biblical evidence seems to show that prophecy had its origin. The prophetic movement, however, may not been to have touched its height in the time of I, since the high places are still held in great honor, and worship at them is not yet considered to be offensive to Yahweh, as seen about from the influence of Hosea. Furthermore, the priests were the respected men of the author's day since it is as a priest that I has described the founder of the nation, Moses.

1. Gen. XII 7, I-. XV 18, 20. XI 26-29. XIII, XXII, XXIV.

2. Gf. I Sam. IX. Ex narratives of Saul and Elisha in the books I Kings, I Sam. XXIV, are well of less in Israel. and Ruben.

3. Kittelsen, The Patriarchs, p. 100 f.

His repeated emphasis on the ritual connected with the religion also shows a sympathy with the interests of most importance to the priestly group.[1] This situation recalls the incident in Amos VII in which the prophet, who has been speaking in Bethel, clashes with the priest Amaziah. Here we see that the prophets in the time of the Elohist writer and the period of activity of the prophet Amos are regarded as erratic fanatics, and it is the priests who constitute the influential group in the land. Furthermore, the atmosphere throughout the E document is full of confidence in the national prosperity, and there is no evidence of fear of the Arameans. All of these factors recall the period of peace enjoyed in the reign of Jeroboam II; and it is to this date that we are brought for the composition of the E document particularly because the later advance of the Assyrians cannot yet have taken place, for the tribes of Dan, Naphtali, Zebulon, and Gilead still exist among the sons of Israel, and their territory was captured by Tiglath-pileser III in the year 734 B.C. It therefore seems probable that the E document was written in approximately the year 750 B.C.[2]

1. See below in this chapter.

2. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, pp. 178-184.

While the sources J and E are so closely mingled in many places that it is difficult to separate them, they often show characteristic differences in the literary art of the authors so that the hand which was responsible for a particular passage is betrayed by its customary technique. J, as a whole, is more skilful than E in unifying his narrative. After an introduction in the opening verses of Gen. XII in which the future triumphal progress of the people of Israel is envisaged, the narratives of J are presented in sequence, each forming a link in a chain which carries ever forward the theme of the opening passage. E, on the other hand, is not so successful in linking his incidents. As has been pointed out by Gautier,[1] J is a narrator, E an anecdotist. "Somme toute,"[2] he says, "les récits de E sont plus épisodiques, moins suivis que ceux de J: les détails sont donnés comme ayant leur valeur propre, sans grande préoccupation de l'ensemble. Le plan général, tracé d'une façon si magistrale et si claire dans J, apparaît moins nettement dans l'oeuvre de l'Elohiste."

While the narrative of J is vivid and colorful, and the incidents are related with great dramatic ability, E, on the other hand, is prosaic and matter of fact, so

1. Trabaud, L'Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, p. 50.
2. Gautier, Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, vol. I, p. 133.

While the sources I and 3 are so closely
mingled in many places that it is difficult to separate
them, they often show characteristic differences in the
literary art of the authors so that the hand which was
responsible for a particular passage is betrayed by its
customary technique. I, on a whole, is more skilful
than 3 in writing his narrative. After an introduction
in the opening verses of Gen. III he sets the future
national progress of the people of Israel in antiquity,
the narratives of 3 are presented in sequence, each
forming a link in a chain which carries over towards the
image of the opening passage. 2, on the other hand, is
not so successful in linking his incidents. As has been
pointed out by Gunkel, 2 is a narrator, 3 an arrangeur.
"Dans toute," he says, "les récits de 2 sont plus
spirituels, moins naïfs, mais tout de 3: les détails sont
souvent comme ajouté leur valeur propre, sans grande
préoccupation de l'ensemble. Le plan général, trahi
d'une façon si manifeste et si naïf dans 3, apparaît
moins malheureux dans l'oeuvre de 2."[1]

While the narrative of 1 is vivid and colorful,
and his incidents are invested with great dramatic ability,
2, on the other hand, is strongly the writer of law, so

1. Gunkel, L'Histoire-Question à l'Ancien Testament, p. 60.
2. Gunkel, Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, vol. 1.
p. 102.

much concerned about the content of the stories that he lacks the imagination and appreciation of details which make J a great story-teller. This is evident in a comparison of Gen. XII 10-20 and XX, the former from J, and the latter E. In Gen. XII 10-13 the circumstances demanding Abram's lie are presented by J very skilfully so that the reader's interest is held by Sarai's great beauty and Abram's cleverness. The ethical correctness of Abram's act, however, was so questionable in E's mind that in Gen. XX 1 and 2 the content of the four verses of J is summarized until the situation can hardly be understood, and the author hurries on regardless to a justification of Abraham's act. Likewise in a comparison of the E and J material in Gen. XXX and XXXI the vividness and human interest which are evident in the J story of Jacob's cleverness in outwitting Laban are lost in the long speech of Jacob to his wives justifying himself in all his relations with his father-in-law. On the other hand, E is not lacking in narrative ability, if it is less developed than in his predecessor. This is seen particularly in Gen. XXII, where, as Carpenter and Harford[1] point out, "the simple pathos of the recital, the restraint of Abraham and the artlessness of Isaac, show that E like J possesses in an

1. Carpenter and Harford, Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 216.

such concerned about the conduct of the article but
it lacks the imagination and appreciation of details
which make it a great story-teller. Talking evidence
in a conversation of men, III 10-22 and 34, the former
from I, and the latter from E. In Act III 10-18 has air-
quaintance's description about's life and treasures of I
very difficult to best the reader's interest in both
of Saint's great beauty and Adam's ignorance. The
student experience of Adam's act, however, was so
questionable in I's view that in Act. VI I and 2 the
content of the four verses of I is unnecessary; only
attention can easily be unexcited, and his greater
duties or responsibilities in a justification of Ernest's
act. Likewise in a comparison of Act 2 and 3 essential
in Act. VII and XIII the witnesses are many interest
which are evident in the 2 story of Jacob's cleverness
in outwitting Laban are Isaac in the long speech of Jacob to
his wives justifying himself in all his relations with
his father-in-law. On the other hand, E is not lacking
in narrative reality. If it is less developed than in
his predecessor. This is seen particularly in Act. VIII,
where, as Carpenter and Griffith point out, "the single
patios of the realist, the material of Abraham and the
artlessness of Isaac. Ever that E like I possesses in an

1. Carpenter and Griffith. Composition of the Hexateuch,
p. 216.

eminent degree the capacity for narration, though the fragmentary character of many of his stories partially conceals it. In the Joseph cycle, however, it is well displayed; while on the other hand the E elements in the plague-series lack the dramatic character which distinguishes J's colloquies between Moses and Pharaoh, and the recurring use of the rod on the part of Moses seems less direct and impressive than the immediate agency of Yahweh described by J."

This difference in dramatic ability between J and E is partly a result of E's more serious and reflective mind. He finds offensive elements in some of the J narratives which he is at pains to remove in his own epic. He objects to dishonesty in the founders of his people and he explains in Gen. XX how Abraham could have been speaking the truth when he called Sarah his sister. In Gen. XXI 9-21 he lays the blame for Sarah's violent expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael on Ishmael's own disagreeable actions, and justifies Abraham in his rather heartless acquiescence in Sarah's brutality by a divine vision in which God shows that such a course is a part of his purpose. The hostility of Joseph's brothers (Gen. XXXVII), which in J is carried to such an extent that even Judah is willing to leave Joseph to die in a pit in the wilderness, in E is softened so that Reuben, at least, the first-born

and leader among them, plans cleverly to return and save the lad. He is only frustrated by passing Midianites who kidnap Joseph and carry him to Egypt. Not only is E jealous for the patriarchs' reputations, but he sees difficulties in J's stories of the participation of God in the heroes' questionable activities. In Gen. XX God appears to Abimelech in a dream and shows himself to be a god of righteousness even to a man outside of Israel. In the parallel story of J in Gen. XII 10-20, however, Yahweh had plagued Pharaoh with great plagues, although he had committed no intentional fault. Again in Gen. XXI God acts with a high purpose for the future of Ishmael and of Abraham when he wills that the lad and his mother be driven out. Even the evil which the brothers of Joseph carry out against him E explains that they sincerely regret, and at the same time he shows that God acted through them to bring preservation for Israel at the time of famine.[1] This serious mood of E is ever prominent in his work, and never is there found the whimsical mood which occasionally appears in passages of the J document.[2] And, on the other hand, never in J is there found

1. Gen. XLII 21,22, XLV 3-8, L 17-21.

2. Cf., for example, Gen. XXV 29-34, and Gunkel, Genesis, p. 271 f., where, although the passage is assigned to E, the humor of the narrative is clearly brought out.

and Isaac among them, plays cleverly on terms and
save the lad. He is only threatened by Jacob's
the kidnap Joseph and carry him to Egypt. But only
is E jealous for the patriarchal reputation, but he
sees difficulties in J's account of the participation
of God in the brothers' questionable activities. In Gen.
XX God appears to Abimelech in a dream and shows himself
to be a god of righteousness even to a man outside of
Israel. In the parallel story of J in Gen. XII 10-20,
however, Pharaoh and plagued Pharaoh with great diseases,
although he had committed no intentional fault. Again in
Gen. XXI God deals with a high purpose for the honour of
Ishmael and of Abraham when he wills that the lad and his
mother be driven out. Even the evil which the brothers
of Joseph carry out against him E explains that they
sincerely regret, and at the same time he shows that God
acted beyond them to bring preservation for Israel at the
time of famine.[1] This serious mood of E is ever prominent
in his work, and never is there found the whimsical mood
which occasionally appears in passages of the J document.[2]
And, on the other hand, never in J is there found

1. Gen. XLIV 33,34, XLV 5-8, I 17-21.

2. Cf., for example, Gen. XXV 29-34, and Swabey, Genesis,
p. 271 f., where, although the parallel in Esau's
to E, the humor of the narrative is clearly brought
out.

an obvious attempt to instruct his readers in moral principles. The work of J is more subtle; with fineness and simplicity of touch his anecdotes are sketched so that the generosity and courtesy of such figures as Abraham stand out, to be impressed all the more on his readers because J's ideas are caught unawares.

With E's serious mood is connected also an appreciation of all that is tender and appealing to the emotions. The pathos of Abraham's willingness to sacrifice Isaac (Gen. XXII) in spite of his overpowering love for the boy is not excelled in any other writer. Nor could J improve on the sympathy with which the birth of Moses and the care of Moses's mother and sister for him are described by E (Ex. II). In many other chapters also E's delight in picturing the emotions comes forth in a very prominent way.[1]

E's preciseness in regard to details is a further characteristic of this author. In him alone we learn that the nurse who accompanied Rebekah on her journey to Canaan was named Deborah (Gen. XXXV 8). The Egyptian whom Joseph served in Egypt was unnamed by the J document, but in E it is stated definitely that the man's name was Potiphar. Likewise to the two midwives, minor characters in the birth story of Ex. I, are given the names Shiphrah and Puah (v.15);

1. Cf. particularly Gen. XXI 9-21, XXIX, XXXI, XLII, L.

and in E Jethro, the name of Moses's father-in-law is used frequently, while in J it is probable that no name is given to him.[1] Since in E names are assigned to even unimportant characters, the absence of names in Ex. II for Moses's father and mother is striking. Likewise in this chapter the sister is not named, and it is not until much later in the epic (Ex. XV 20,21 for the first time) that Miriam is mentioned by E. Whether this fact is a result of E's fidelity to tradition, and it is his acknowledgment that the origin of Moses was not known, or whether a section of E is missing at this point cannot be determined. Of course it may be observed that the origin of Abraham is likewise not referred to by E. In this same connection it is worth while to notice that Aaron, who plays an important role in later writers, and appears simply as the brother of Moses in E, was probably never mentioned by J. All references to him, it is widely recognized, are the result of work of a redactor.[2]

1. For an able discussion of the latter question Holzinger's Hexateuch, p. 75 f. is very useful. According to Wellhausen, as Holzinger says, "hat J ursprünglich vielleicht überhaupt keinen Namen genannt (es scheint, dass WELLH hiebei Jud. I 16 im Auge hat); der Name Re'uël erscheine Ex. II an verspäteter Stelle, seine Herkunft aus J, sowie dass Nu. X 29, mit dem Vater Chobabs der Priester von Midian mit seinen 7 Töchtern gemeint sei, wird daher bezweifelt (Wc 72 101). Darüber, ob das חתן משה dieser Stelle ursprünglich sei, spricht WELLHAUSEN sich nicht aus. Die Sachlage wäre darnach zunächst die, dass der Schwiegervater des Moses bei J namenlos wäre, bei E Jithro hiesse."

2. Holzinger, op. cit., p. 76 f.

and in E Zeuxis, the name of Moses's father-in-law is used frequently, while in J it is probable that no name is given to him.[1] Since in E names are assigned to even unimportant characters, the absence of names in Ex. II for Moses's father and mother is striking. Likewise in this chapter the pilot is not named, and it is not until much later in the epic (Ex. XX 10,22) for the first time that Miriam is mentioned by E. Whether this fact is a result of E's fidelity to tradition, and it is his acknowledgment that the origin of Moses was not known, or whether a section of E is missing at this point cannot be determined. Of course it may be observed that the oracle of Abraham is likewise not referred to by E. In this case consideration is worth while to notice that Aaron, who plays an important role in later writers, and appears simply as the brother of Moses in J, was probably never mentioned by J. All references to him, it is widely recognized, are the result of work of a redactor.

1. For an able discussion of the Jethro question McKinnger's Hexateuch, p. 75 f. is very useful. According to Pelikanes, as McKinnger says, that J mentioned Zeuxis visibleit Abraham Weiten Gunar Gesamt (as sonsint, dana TT.II Midsel Zun, I id in Ayes b-t); der Name Ze'ubi erscheint Ex. II in verschiedener Stelle. seine Bermuntt ane J. sonre dass in. E zu. mit den Jetzt Tochter der Priester von Midian mit seinen 7 Töchter Jresaint sei, wird dabei Gesellschaft (Ex II 16). Berufer, ob ich von dem dieser Stelle ausgeschlossen sei. gerient MIDIANUSSEN sich nicht nur. Die Gesellschaft wird Jethro zugeteilt ist, dass der Schwiegervater des Moses bei J Hebräisch wäre. Ich E Jitro Midiane."

2. McKinnger, op. cit.: p. 75 f.

A further characteristic distinction between the authors J and E is the frequent delight in the former source in the picture of nomadic life. In the J stories Abraham and Jacob are pictured as wandering nomads, and their kinsmen in Haran are likewise tenders of flocks (Gen. XXIV, XXIX, XXXI, XXXII). Also in the flight of Moses to Midian the opportunity is seized by the J writer to describe the nomadic life of these people who were related to Israel (Ex. II 15-22). The E writer, however, while he makes no essential change in the life of the patriarchs as told by J, fails to include any of these piquant scenes in his epic and betrays himself thereby as the more cosmopolitan of the authors. He seems to be little acquainted with the delights of the shepherd life as J must have known them in his home in the Judean highlands, but the location of E in the more progressive north would naturally bring a certain lack of sympathy for the conservative people in that less developed region. It was in the section of the country, it will be recalled, in which E made his home that such a deviation from the simplicity of early Israelitic ideals became apparent that a reaction arose in the time of Jehu leading to the formation of the sect of Rechabites (II Kgs. X 15 ff.). This reactionary movement, however, in favor of the nomadic life does not seem to have exerted any influence on our Elohist writer.

A further characteristic distinction between the epistles I and II is the frequent delight in the joyous source in the picture of nomadic life. In the 1 stories Abraham and Jacob are pictured as nomadic people, and their kinsmen in Edom are hilarious members of Esau's (Ex. XXIV, XXIX, XXXI, XXXII). Also in the flight of Moses to Midian the opportunity is seized by the J writer to describe the nomadic life of these people who were related to Israel (Ex. II 15-22). The E writer, however, may be makes no essential change in the life of the patriarchs as laid by J, fails to include any of these element seems to the date and betrays himself to prove be the more sophistication of the author. He seems to be little acquainted with the delights of the wandered life as J must have known them in his home in the Judean highlands, and the location of E in the more progressive North could naturally bring a certain taste of novelty for the conservative people in that less developed region. It was in the service of the country, it will be remembered, if Moses E came his home land such a revelation from the simplicity of earlier Israelitish ideals became apparent that a reaction arose in the time of John leading to the formation of the cast of Deuteronomy (II Kgs. XXIII 21.). This reactionary movement, however, in favor of the nomadic life came not even to have a lasting influence on our Elohistic writer.

The vocabulary of E differs widely from that of J. The following is a brief list of some of the differences which appear most often in the documents:

J	E
יקוה	אלהים
שפחה	אתה
Canaanite	Amorite
Israel (often after Gen. XXXII)	Jacob (throughout)
Sinai	Horeb
צער	קטן
הכבד or כבד	חזק לב פ׳
	נתן (permit)
	תצבה

Some unusual infinitives are found in E's narrative. A list of some of them is given by Holzinger on p. 190 of his Hexateuch. He shows that E uses הלוך instead of the more usual לכת (Ex. III 19, Nu. XXII 13,14,16), דעה instead of דעת (Ex. II 4), רדה instead of רדת (Gen. XLVI 3), עשן (Gen. XXXI 28), עשה (Gen. L 20), ראה (Gen. XLVIII 11), עשהו (Ex. XVIII 18), and נתן (Nu. XX 21, but cf. Gen. XXXVIII 9). In addition E prefers to use את with a suffix (Nota acc.) instead of the verbal suffix. He often uses the expression "he called (some one)" and follows it by the reply "here am I". The phrases ויהי בעת ההיא and ויהי אחר הדברים האלה are

The possibility of J differs widely from that of I. The following is a brief list of some of the differences which appear most often in the documents:

J	I
Jesus	Yeshua
Joshua	Yehoshua
Jerusalem	Yerushalayim
Israel (often after Gen. XXXII)	Jacob (thereafter)
Sinai	Horeb
Jesse	Ishai
Job of Jobab	Iyyob
Jonah (Jerusalem)	Yona
Jonah	Yonah

Some unusual infinitives are found in I's corrective. A list of some of them is given by Holmgren on p. 130 of his [illegible]. He shows that I uses יָדוֹן instead of the more usual יָדֹן (Ex. VII 19, Nu. XXXI 10,14,16), שָׁרוֹ instead of שָׁרֹ (Ex. II 4), חָרוֹ instead of חָרֹ (Gen. XXVI 8), שָׁעוֹ (Gen. XXVII 33), חָנוֹ (Gen. I 20), חָנוֹ (Gen. XXVIII 11), נָגוֹעַ (Ex. XVIII 15), and נָגוֹעַ (Ex. XX 22; out cf. Gen. XXVIII 9). In addition I prefers to use an עלה with a suffix (note sec.) instead of the verbal suffix. He often uses the expression "he called (some one)" and follows it by the reply "here am I". The phrases הִנֶּנִי אֵלֶיךָ and הִנֶּנִי אֵלֶיהָ are

frequent in his writings, although it is not impossible to find instances of them in J (cf. Gen. XXXIX 7 (J) for the use of the latter expression). Similarly הִשְׁכִּם בַּבֹּקֶר is more common in E than in J, although it occurs in both documents. A distinguishing feature of E is also the expression "the man Moses." What explanation is to be offered for these very clear linguistic distinctions between the J and E documents is by no means certain. It is possible that they can be explained by a difference in dialect in the two regions of the country Ephraim and Judah. A similar distinction has been found to exist between the two sections of the Elijah and Elisha narratives in the books of Kings, and also between the two stories of Deborah in Ju.IV and V. There is, of course, the additional evidence of the story in Ju. XII in which the difference of pronunciation between the men of Gilead and those of Ephraim is referred to -- the inability of the Ephraimites to say Shibboleth. For the greater part, however, we are lacking in knowledge of dialectical differences between the different parts of Palestine.

In religion likewise the sources J and E show very marked differences. In J Yahweh has been worshipped by the people as Yahweh from the early days of the founders of the nation; but in E the tradition is somewhat different. The dominating thought of the latter work is a belief, as in

frequent in his writings, although it is not impossible to find instances of them in I (cf. esp. Ps.113 & (3) for the use of the latter expression). Similarly אדון is more common in E than in J, although it occurs in both documents. A distinguishing feature of E is also the expression "the man Moses." That explanation is to be offered for these very clear linguistic similarities between the J and E documents is by no means certain. It is possible that they are to contribute by a difference in indent in the two regions of the country Ephraim and Judah. A similar distinction has been found to exist between the two sections of the Elijah and Elisha narratives in the books of Kings, and also between the two stories of Deborah in Jg.IV and V. There is, of course, the additional evidence of the story in Jos. XXI in which the difference of pronunciation between the son of Jesse and those of Ephraim is referred to -- the inability of the Ephraimites to say Shibboleth. For this matter cf. Jeremiah. However, we are limited in knowledge of dialectical differences between the different parts of Palestine.

In religion likewise the sources J and E show very marked differences. The J Yahweh has been envisaged by the people as "newer" from the early days of the formation of the religion; but in E the tradition is somewhat different. The centering concept of the later work is a belief, as in

J, that Yahweh has been Israel's ancestral God; yet at the same time E believes that during the days of the patriarchs Yahweh was not worshipped under that name. In Ex. III he takes pains to show that it is owing to the experience of Moses that Israel learned to know Yahweh by his name. How are we to account for this striking difference of representation in the two Pentateuchal sources, a difference which has been of importance in biblical criticism ever since the days of Astruc and Eichhorn in the eighteenth century? Three suggestions have been offered to explain the situation. The first is that of Luther, in Die Persönlichkeit des Jahwisten.[1] He proposes the theory that J has intentionally changed the material which was handed down to him to make it conform to his own ideas. Thus the significance of Sinai for the religion of Israel was effaced by J. "Der Grund," he says (p. 122), "wäre vielleicht wieder, dass mit der Nennung des Sinai an die ausserisraelitische Herkunft der Jahvereligion erinnert würde." Procksch, on the other hand, (p. 197 ff. of Die Elohimquelle) views the use of אלהים in the E source as evidence of monotheism in the beliefs of the writer. He considers that this is a result of the work of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, under whose influence he supposes E to have stood, and

1. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 121 f.

he calls attention to the supporting fact that not only before, but also after Ex. III אלהים is the usual word for God. The presence of monotheism among the people of Israel, however, is very doubtful until the time of Second Isaiah. The preference of E for the word אלהים even after Ex. III must probably be explained in some other way. It may be that E lived near an important sanctuary, such as, perhaps, Bethel, where the priests were in the habit of using the general expression "the God" (האלהים) in reference to the deity worshipped in that spot without fear of misunderstanding on the part of those around about them. In a similar way people living near Boston today may speak colloquially of going "to town" and have no fear that their hearers will suppose them to refer to any other than the near by city. A third explanation of the difference in the word for god employed by the J and E sources has been offered by G. A. Barton in his Sketch of Semitic Origins (pp. 272-278) and by G. F. Moore in his History of Religions (p. 4). These scholars suggest that it may have been a result of a genuine variation in traditions that were current in the two sections of the country from which the authors came. The northern tribes learned through Moses to worship Yahweh, as a result of Moses's connection with the Kenites. The southern tribes, however, had lived long in the region in the south of Palestine not far away from the Kenites, and the worship of Yahweh had

been carried on by them from such antiquity that they believed, as J maintained, that he had always been worshipped among them. If this last suggestion is the correct one, as seems to be probable, valuable tradition has been preserved by both writers: in J the tradition that the worship of Yahweh was of immemorial antiquity in the tribe of Judah, and in E that it was not known by the tribes in the north until the days of Moses.

It may be that a further tradition concerning the patriarchal religion has been preserved by E in Gen. XXXV 1-4, where the patriarchs are said to have been idolaters.[1] That this is an authentic portion of the E document as it stands, however, may be doubted since the expression אלהי הנכר is found elsewhere, aside from Jos. XXIV 20, 23, only in late passages. Ju. X 16 is in the deuteronomic portion of the book; I Sam. VII 3 is from a late strand of I Samuel; and the other occurrences of the expression[2] all come from the period of deuteronomic activity or later. Chapter XXIV of Joshua likewise can by no means be assigned as a whole to E, for it contains many later elements, and whatever early kernel is present has undoubtedly been reworked by very late writers. It seems, therefore, probable that we shall not be far wrong when we consider that the hand which was responsible for

1. Carpenter and Harford, Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 203.

2. Jer. V 19, II Chr. XXXIII 15, Dt. XXXI 16, XXXII 12, Mal. II 11, Ps. LXXXI 10, Dn. XI 39.

been derived or by them from such antiquity that they believed, as I maintained, that we have always been worshipped among them. If this last suggestion is the correct one, as seems to be probable, valuable tradition has been preserved by both writers: in I the tradition that the notoriety of Ximenes was of immemorial antiquity in the tribe of Judah, and in R that it was not known by the tribes in the north until the days of Moses.

It may be that a further tradition concerning the patriarchal religion was also preserved by I in Gen. XXIV 1-4, where the patriarchs are said to have been idolators. That this is an authentic portion of the I document as it stands, however, may be doubted since the expression אלהי השמים is Deuto-Isaiahic, while from Gen. XXIV 50, 51, only in late passages. Or, if it is in the contretonomic portion of the book: I Gen. XII 2 is from a late strata of I document; and the other occurrences are expression XII came from the period of deuteronomic activity or later. Chapter XXIV of course differs can be no more be assigned as a whole to I, for it contains many later elements, and whatever basis it may have had in a presumably ancient tradition has received by very late writers. It seems, therefore, probable that we shall not be far wrong when we consider that the home which was responsible for

1. Chronicles and Ezekiel. Composition of the Pentateuch p. 434.

2. Ger. I 1; II Cor. XXXIII 3, 4. XXXI 16, XXXII 14, Nor. II 11, Ex. XXXII 10, Dt. 20.

the revision of Jos. XXIV may very likely have added its contribution to Gen. XXXV 1-4 also; and although a part of these verses may come from E, the references at least to idolatry in the passage are not an authentic part of the E document. No evidence opposing this view is found in the story of the golden calf, for while part of Ex. XXXII probably belongs to E, the parallel between the sin of Aaron and the sin of Jeroboam as emphasized by the deuteronomists is so great as to render it probable that the story of the golden calf is deuteronomic work. Procksch (Die Elohimquelle, p. 91) helps to confirm this opinion. His study of the chapter has brought him to attribute the story to a late strand of E, but he adds, "Die jüngere Erzählung vom goldenen Kalbe ... nähert sich der deuteronomischen Schule stark an."

Because E lived at a later time than J the deity is described by him in less anthropomorphic terms than J employed. The direct theophanies of the early source seemed improbable to the later writer who described all the communication between the god and his worshipper as through the medium of angels[1] or during the course of dreams.[2] The deity was becoming, even by the time of E, too exalted

1. Gen. XXVIII, XXXI 11, XXXII 1,2, Ex. XIV 19.

2. Gen. XX 3,6, XXVIII, XXXI 11,24, XXXVII, XL, XLI.

the revision of Jon. XIV may very likely have caused its
subjunction to Gen. XXIV 1-4; there one situation & part of
these verses are close from E, the references at least to
idolatry in the passage are not an authentic part of Jon 2
document. The evidence supporting this view is found in the
entry of the golden calf. The entire part of Jon. XXXII
probably belongs to E, the parallel between the sin of
Aaron and the sin of Jeroboam is explainable by the
deuteronomistic in so great as to render it probable that
the story of the golden calf is deuteronomistic work. Compare
(Die Einhungsalte, p. 71) Volz to confirm this opinion.
His study of the chapter was brought him to attribute the
story to a late strand of E, but he says, "Die Ähnlichkeit
beschränkt sich vielmehr darin ... wenigstens eine der
deuteronomistischen Redaktionen."

Jeremiah I lived at a later time than J the daily
is described by him in less anthropomorphic terms than J
depicted. The direct theophanies of the early source
seemed improbable to the later writer. The description of
the communication between the god and his worshipped is
through the medium of oracle or writing has course of events.
The deity was becoming, even in the time of E, too exalted

1. Gen. XXVIII, XXXI 24. Exod I,4, Num. 22, XIV 17.
2. Gen. XX 7,8, XXVIII. Exod 11.7, XXVIII. 22, XII.

to speak directly to man.[1]

The god of E had also become an ethical god. In Gen. XII 10-20 (J), since it was to the advantage of Yahweh's favorite, Abram, that plagues should be inflicted upon Pharaoh, Yahweh was pictured unquestioningly by the J writer as imposing this calamity upon the Egyptian even though there was no fault to be found with the man. In the time when this early story was written such a procedure did not seem to be objectionable, since it concerned only a foreigner. By the time of E, however, Gen. XX shows that the opinion of the people had undergone a change. God was pictured in this chapter as a just deity who prevented Abimelech from committing an unwitting error, and who therefore brought no punishment upon him or his house. Even to a foreigner God was a god of justice. Again in Gen. XXXI the deity was not described by E, as by J, as an unscrupulous being who worked for his worshipper's advantage irrespective of justice to both people concerned in the situation. In E Laban was responsible for his own failure, since as soon as he saw Jacob's increasing prosperity, in the attempt to enrich himself and to bring poverty upon his son-in-law he repeatedly altered the terms of the compact to which he had previously agreed.

1. The experience of Moses is the only exception to this statement, but the work of Moses seemed to E of such fundamental importance that it was natural that it should be instigated by direct suggestions of the deity to him.

to speak directly to man.[1]

The god of E has also become an ethical god. In Gen. XXI 10-20 (J), since it was to the advantage of Yahweh's favorite, Abram, that pigmies should be inflicted upon Pharaoh, Yahweh was pictured unquestionably by the J writer as imposing this calamity upon the Egyptian even though there was no fault to be found with the man. In the time when this early story was written such a procedure did not seem to be objectionable, since it concerned only a foreigner. By the time of E, however, Gen. XX shows that the opinion of the people had undergone a change. God was pictured in this chapter as a just deity who prevented Abimelech from committing an unwitting error, and who therefore brought no punishment upon him or his house. Even to a foreigner God was a god of justice. Again in Gen. XXXI the deity was not described by E, as by J, as an unscrupulous being who worked for his scrapper's advantage irrespective of justice to both people concerned in the situation. In E Laban was responsible for his own failure, since as soon as he saw Jacob's increasing prosperity, in the attempt to enrich himself and to bring poverty upon his son-in-law he repeatedly altered the terms of the compact to which he had previously agreed.

1. The experience of Moses is the only exception to this statement, but the work of Moses ceased to E at such fundamental importance that it was natural that it should be instigated by direct suggestions of the deity in him.

In E, in striking contrast to the situation in the Yahwistic source, a strong interest in ritual was evidenced. In J, throughout the document, all references to sacrifice were suppressed, although it was admitted that altars were erected in the land. In E, on the other hand, one of the most vivid stories of the epic (Gen. XXII) described the substitution of animal for human sacrifice; and Gen. XLVI 1 mentioned the sacrifice at Beersheba as the last act of Jacob before leaving the land to join Joseph in Egypt. Compare also Jethro's offering of a sacrifice in Ex. XVIII. Likewise the sacred stones, the mazzebahs, which formed so important a feature in the furnishing of the local sanctuaries of this early day, were continually referred to with approval by E, and descriptions were given of the respect which the patriarchs showed them in anointing them with oil.[1] The ceremonial in connection with the various acts of worship at Horeb is also frequently referred to by the northern source and entirely omitted by J. Compare in this respect Ex. XIX and XXXIII.

It is thus the practices of interest to the priests which E considered most important for the religion of his day, and in harmony with this view he described Moses as possessing the functions of a priest and magician.[2]

1. Gen. XXVIII, XXXI 51,52, XXXV 20.

2. Hölscher, Die Profeten, p. 109 f.

In E, in striking contrast to the situation in the Yahwistic source, - strong interest in ritual was evinced. In J, throughout the document, all references to sacrifice were suppressed, although it was admitted that altars were erected in the land. In E, on the other hand, one of the most vivid stories of the epic (Gen. XXII) describes the substitution of animal for human sacrifice; and Gen. XLVI I mentioned the sacrifice at Beersheba on the last act of Jacob before leaving the land to join Joseph in Egypt. Compare also Jethro's offering of a sacrifice in Ex. XVIII. Likewise the sacred stones, the massebas, which formed an important a feature in the furnishing of the local sanctuaries at this early day, were continually referred to with approval by E, and descriptions were given of the respect[1] which the patriarchs showed them in anointing them with oil. The sacramental in connection with the various acts of worship at Horeb is also frequently referred to by the northern source and entirely omitted by J. Compare in this respect Ex. XIX and XXXIII.

It is thus the practice of interest to the priests which E considered most important for the religion of his day, and in harmony with this view he described Moses as possessing the functions of a priest and magician.[2]

1. Gen. XXVIII, XXXI 51,52, XXXV 20.

2. Holscher, Die Profeten, p. 109 f.

Moses was no longer the simple instrument of Yahweh, as in J, possessed of doubts, and frequently overwhelmed by despair. He was now a wonder man who by himself performed miracles. He it was who officiated at the shrine (Ex. XXXIII, Dt. XXXI) and who gave oracular decisions (Ex.XVIII). True to the functions of the early priest he was administrator of a sanctuary and transmitter of the sacerdotal and civil law.

Yet in spite of the respect which E constantly revealed for the priesthood he also, as has been said above, showed his acquaintance with prophecy, which had its greatest sphere of influence in the northern kingdom where was E's home. He nowhere acceded to the demands of the great prophetic leaders of a later time that ritual be subordinated in the worship of the nation; nevertheless, in E there appeared occasional references to the prophetic function, as, for example, in the story of Balaam in Nu. XXII and XXIII, which surprisingly admits the presence of a prophet of Yahweh among a people other than the nation of Israel. Whether also E was responsible for calling Abraham a prophet in Gen. XX 7, and Miriam a prophetess in Ex. XV 20, and whether the outright approbation of all prophets expressed in Nu. XI 25-29 is to be considered as belonging to E, rather than to a man who lived nearer the time of the deuteronomists, may reasonably be doubted,

Moses was no longer the single instrument of Yahweh, as in J, possessed of doubts, and frequently overwhelmed by despair. He was now a wonder man who by himself performed miracles. He is also officiated at the shrine (Ex. XXIII, 14. XXXI) and who gave oracular decisions (Ex. XVIII). True to the functions of the early priest he was combinator of a secretary and treasurer of the secretarial and civil law.

Yet in spite of the respect which E consistently revealed for the priesthood he also, as has been said, showed his acquaintance with prophecy, which had its greatest sphere of influence in the northern kingdom where was E's home. He moreover adapted to the demands of the great prophetic leaders of a later time that ritual be subordinated in the worship of the nation. Nevertheless, in E there appeared secondary references to the prophetic function, as, for example, in the story of Balaam in Nu. XXII and XXIII, which surprisingly ascribe the gift of a prophet of Yahweh among a people other than the nation of Israel. Another also E was responsible for calling Abraham a prophet in Gen. XX 7, and Miriam a prophetess in Ex. XV 20, and whether the outright appropriation of all prophetic experiences in Nu. XI 24-29 is to be considered as belonging to E, rather than to a man who lived nearer the time of the Deuteronomists, may reasonably be doubted.

however, in view of the opposition which Amos VII shows was characteristic of the attitude of the priestly sympathizers in their relation to the prophetic group.

In connection with the comparatively humble role which Moses played in the J document there was no need of the appearance of Aaron, and, as has been observed in a preceding paragraph, it is probable that he was not mentioned at all. The deuteronomic and priestly writers are the ones who gave such great importance to the brother of Moses. It is probable, however, that a preparation for this later development was offered by the Elohist writer, who seems to have been acquainted with Aaron and to have given him a small place in his work. The important place beside Moses which later writers assigned to him E seems to have given to Joshua. Aaron's function in this document Holzinger has summarized as follows(p. 176): "So weit die Person des Aaron bei E deutlich ist, kann man ihn sich fast nur als einen der זקנים, der Notabeln, denken; vielleicht sind Aaron und Hur als deren Vormänner anzusehen; Ex. XVIII 12 und XXIV 1-14 ..... wenigstens könnten darauf führen."

In commenting above on the priestly activities of Moses it has been mentioned that great stress has been given by E to Moses as a wonder worker, a magician. One of the most outstanding differences between the J and E documents is this delight of E in the supernatural in the

lowter, in view of the composition which dates XII scores the characteristics of the attitude of the priestly sympathizers in their relation to the prophetic group.

In connection with the comparatively humble role which Moses played in the J document there was no need of the appearance of Aaron, and, as has been observed in a preceding paragraph, it is probable that he was not mentioned at all. The deuteronomic and priestly writers are the ones who gave such great importance to the brother of Moses. It is probable, however, that a preparation for this later development was offered by the Elohist writer, who seems to have been acquainted with Aaron and to have given him a small place in his work. The important place basis which later writers assigned to his 3 sons to have given to Levites. Aaron's function in this movement mentioned has something to follow(1, 174): "So will die Person des Aaron mit E deutlich ist, hier sei ihm eine Tat auf die eigene der Stämme, der Stammes, indem: vielleicht wird Aaron und der als deren Vorfahrer anzusehen; Ex. XVIII 12 und XXIV 1-14 ..... wahrscheinlich schreiben dürfen."

In commenting above on the priestly activities of Moses it has been mentioned that great stress has been given by E to Moses as a wonder worker, a mediator. One of the most outstanding differences between the J and E documents is this delight of E in the supernatural in the

Mosaic period and during the time of the conquest. To Moses is given the power to bring about the plagues before Pharaoh by use of his magic rod. He causes the sea to divide by the simple extension of this same rod (Ex. XIV). The people are led through the wilderness by an angel (Ex. XIV 19), instead of by a pillar of cloud and fire, as in J (Ex. XIII 21,22, XIV 19,20). Water is obtained miraculously by the use of Moses's rod at the mount of Horeb (Ex. XVII 3-6). By means of that same rod a battle with the Amalekites is brought to a victorious ending (Ex. XVII 8-16). The tables of stone are inscribed by the finger of God (Ex. XXXI 18), whereas in J it is Moses who writes the words upon them (Ex. XXXIV 28). The crossing of the Jordan by the tribes of Israel is made possible by a miraculous parting of the water (Jos. III), as in similar fashion the Red Sea parted according to the story of the exodus earlier in the E document. All of these incidents show how important the element of the supernatural was in E's religion; and the religion of J is in striking contrast to it, for in the latter document Yahweh brings about the deliverance of the people himself, working usually by means of natural phenomena.

In content also the sources J and E show many differences from each other. While both narratives are parallel throughout, each has its own peculiar material. In J alone may be found, for example, the stories of Lot

and Abraham in Gen. XIII, XVIII, and XIX. As southern stories around the exclusively Judean sanctuary of Hebron the absence of these in the E document is not surprising. Also in Gen. XXV 29-34 (J's story of Jacob's purchase of the birthright) it is not to be wondered at that E is not present, since in Gen. XXVII a story is told by E sufficient to account for Jacob's acquisition of the rights of his brother. E, who lived at a greater distance from Edom than did J, had no incentive to overemphasize Esau's stupidity. The story of the circumcision of Moses's son (Ex. IV 24-26) is naturally not found in E because in that document the origin of circumcision is attributed to Joshua (Jos. V). Likewise four of J's plagues in Ex. VII-IX[1] were so lacking in evidence of the supernatural, since it is evident that each might, through perfectly normal forces follow successively upon the others, that they did not catch the interest of the Elohist. For the same reason, doubtless, Moses's success in making the water of Marah sweet (Ex. XV 23-25a) was not recorded in this document. Whether E was responsible for any of the story of the naming of Massah and Meribah in Ex. XVII is still uncertain; but he naturally did not record the request of Moses that his father-in-law accompany the Israelites on their wilderness

1. The plague of dead fish, of frogs, of flies, and of the murrain of cattle.

and Ahasuerus in Gen. XIII; SPIRIT, see XIX. As a consequence Abraham helped the Philistinic Gerar merchants at Sodom the absence of these in the I document is not surprising. Also in Gen. XXV 20-26 (Ia's story of Jacob's purchase of the birthright) it is not to be considered as that J is our present, since in Gen. XXVII a story is told by E without intent to account for Jacob's acquisition of the rights of the brother. E. was given to a greater familiarity from Esau than did J. and so inclining to overemphasize Jacob's ability. The story of the circumcision of Jacob's son (Gen. XV 1-26) in Exodus XV, Joshua is a fragment in (ibid. document) the origin of circumcision is obliquely to Joshua Ibid. 9). Likewise lack of J's phrases in Gen. VII-12 was so lacking in evidence of the supernatural, since it is evident that our might, because perhaps moral focus falling primarily upon the Abraham, that they did not cross the interest of the Prophet. For his own reason, Jeremiah, Judge's success in finding the motive of Jahwi (Gen. XV 23-25a) was not recorded in this document. Perhaps J was responsible for one of the stories of the Jacob's Theme and Jacob's in Ex. XXVI is also uncertain. Gen. by [illegible] his not reason the reason or there had his father-in-law accompany his [illegible] on their [illegible]

1. The [illegible] of Jacob [illegible], of [illegible], of [illegible], or of the [illegible] of [illegible].

journey (Nu. X 29-32), since in Ex. XVIII 27 he had already stated that Jethro had returned to his own land, and because, furthermore, it was his conception that the unified group were led through the wilderness by the single ark of Yahweh which went before them (Nu. X 33,34). Again in Nu. XXI 1-3 the presence of a J story about the destruction of Hormah which is not paralleled in E may be accounted for by the use of a different story of that town by the E writer in an earlier narrative in Nu. XIV. The town of Hormah was so little known that it would not have been likely to appear in many places in the epics, as did the important cities of Bethel and Beersheba, for instance.

Some material is found only in E, likewise, and we can account for most of it as a result of the author's own particular interests. Thus his delight in affecting scenes would influence him in his decision to include the sacrifice of Isaac (Gen. XXII) and the story of the death of all the male Israelitish children in Egypt but of Moses's fortunate preservation (Ex. I and II). His interest in the worship of the people around about him was great enough to account for much of his unique material in Gen. XXXV, Ex. XII 34,39, XVIII, XIX, and XXIV. His strong partiality for Joseph and the country connected with him (Ephraim) is evidenced by material peculiar to him in Gen. XXVIII, XXXV, L, Ex. XIII, Dt. XXXI, and much of the narrative of Joshua. Similarly

journey (Ex. I 19-[illegible]), since in Ex. XVIII 27 we see
Hyndmer giving Moses leave and returning to his own land.
and because, furthermore, it was his conversion that the
writer group were led towards the allegorics in the
single use of Jethro which were before them (Ex. I 32,34).
Again in Ex. XXI 1-3 the presence of a story about the
destruction of Jethro which is not justified in I may be
accounted for by the use of a different story a that been
by the E writer in a article narrative in Ex. XIV. The
name of Jethro was so little known that it would not have
been likely to appear in some phrase in the epics, as did
the important cities of Bethel and Beersheba, for instance.

Some material is found only in E. Likewise, we
can account for most of it as a result of the author's own
particular interests. Thus his delight in attributing normal
human influence him in his decision to include the narrative
of Jesse (Ex. XIII) and the story of the death of all the
male Israelites children in Egypt but of Moses's circumcise
preservation (Ex. I and II). His interest in the material
of the people around about him was great enough to account
for much of his unique material in Gen. XXIV, Ex. III 21-[illegible],
XVIII, XIX, and XXV. His strong partiality for Jethro and
the country connected with him (Midian) is evidenced by
material peculiar to him in Gen. XXVIII, XXV, I, Ex. XIII,
Ex. XXII, and much of the narrative of Joshua. Similarly

E's desire to show Moses as priest[1], his love of the miraculous[2], his interest in prophecy[3], and his dislike of the Egyptians[4] are manifested in many more of the sections peculiar to him. In other passages found only in E the author's desire to include them in his work seems to rest upon his appreciation that they constituted interesting and valuable tradition; so, for example, with his presentation of Yahweh's revelation of himself to Moses at Horeb (Ex. III) as the first acquaintance of the people with this deity's name; so also with his account of the Edomites' opposition to any traversing of their territory (Nu.XX 14-21).

In much of the material which is directly parallel to J the same situation can be seen. In some of the variations which distinguish E from J evidence of E's own particular interests can be seen; and others may be accounted for by his acceptance of valuable tradition that had not been used by J.

In all of this interplay of conflicting interests can it be determined whether E, the later document, was dependent on the earlier? In answer to that question Procksch (Die Elohimquelle, p. 305 ff.) would say that there was no dependence of E upon J. The process was more

1. Ex. XVIII, XIX, Nu. XXI.
2. Ex. VII, X, XVII..
3. Ex. XV, Nu. XI, XII, XXII, XXIII.
4. Ex. III 21,22, XI 2,3, XII 35, 36.

D's desire to know Rosse as friend, his love of Ly-
[illegible]
[illegible] D's interest in prophecy, and his articles of
the Christian [illegible] considered in [illegible] more of the qualities
possible to him. In other respects Rosse only is a fit
author's desire to include them in his work seems to rest
upon his appreciation that they [illegible] interesting
and valuable traditions; so, too [illegible], with his [illegible]
tion of Vipont's revelation of himself as [illegible] or [illegible]
(Ex. III) as the lines correspondence of the people with [illegible]
dolly's name; so also with his account of the Dominicans'
opposition to the [illegible] of [illegible] (Ex. [illegible])

In such of the material which is directly [illegible]
a line some alteration can be seen. In some of the revisions
which eliminated 2 from 7 evidence of D's own [illegible]
interest can be seen; the other may be accounted for by
his acquaintance of [illegible] tradition that had not been [illegible]
by C.

To all of this interpretation of [illegible] interest
can it be determined whether I, the later document, was
[illegible] or not? In answer to that question
[illegible] (The Dominicans, p. 300 ff.) would see that
there was no [illegible] of 2 upon 1. The process was more

1. Ex. XVIII, XXI, Ex. XXI.
2. Ex. XIV, [illegible] XVII.
3. Ex. XV, Ex. XI, XII, XIII, XIII.
4. Ex. III 21,22, [illegible] 2,3, XII 22. 23.

complicated than that. Granted that much of the tradition was known to both; both, he thinks, rested upon a third source which in its turn was handed down through different channels of transmission until, with the selections peculiar to each epic, they were moulded by the southern and northern writers into the works which went to form our combined JE narrative. On the other hand, Luther[1] has expressed the opposing point of view. "E," he says, "steht völlig in seinem (J's) Banne. Er will ein Konkurrenzwerk schaffen; aber überall sieht man, wie abhängig er ist. Aus der Fülle der Sagen wählt er fast dieselben wie J; selbst in der Auffassung schliesst er sich J an und sucht nur hie und da seine abweichende Ansicht auszusprechen." This, on the whole, seems to the present writer to be in all probability the correct view of the situation. The variations in material in the E and J documents can be accounted for very largely, as has just been shown, by differences of interest on the part of the E author as a result of his later date and his northern home, as well as by his naturally different personality. If more trustworthy information is to be found in his work, as is the case when he tells the story of Abraham's dealings with Abimelech the king of Gerar (Gen. XX) instead of following the tradition of J which in Gen. XXVI made

1. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 169.

Abimelech one of the Philistines, and in Gen. XII substituted for him an Egyptian pharaoh, it may be laid to the persistence of more reliable information of which he had the discrimination to make use. So we may say of his connection of the Israelites with the sons of the east rather than with the people of distant Haran.[1] (Gen. XXIX, XXXI); and similarly we may account for his independence in presenting Reuben instead of Judah as the would-be deliverer of Joseph.[2] The most striking case, however, of retention of tradition independently known by E is of course the section discussed above of the revelation of Yahweh to Moses at Horeb. While it is possible to account for E's omissions and additions, as has just been shown, if the theory that E was dependent on J is accepted, the similarity of Gen. XII 10-20 and XXVI to Gen. XX, of Gen. XVI to Gen. XXI 9-21, of Gen. XXI 22-32 to Gen. XXVI 17-33, and the similarity of the different strands of the J and E narratives in chapters XXVII, XXX, XXXI, and XXXVII of Genesis make it seem very probable that this hypothesis is correct. Particularly is this true when it is also observed that great care is taken by E to correct the aspects of these J narratives which seem

1. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 243; cf. also Chapter I.

2. Cf. Moore, Genesis, in Encycl. Bibl., vol. II, p. 1674, where attention is called to this persistence of an older tradition in the E document.

Minnesota one of the Midlands, and in Sph. XII self-
attitude for his an Arcadian province. It may be said to
be reminiscence or more realistic interpretation of which he
had the diversification to make use. So we may see of
his connection of the Derwellies with the song of the
best rather been with the people of ancient Rome.[1]
(Sec. XIII, 2001); and similarly we may account for his
indemnition in recounting Bunyan instead of Jesus as the
would-be deliverer of Israel.[2] The most ultimate case,
however, of reflection of twelfth immemorially known is
I is of course the section discussed above of his revela-
tion of Yahweh to Moses in Exod. While it is possible to
account for his weighing and additions, as has just been
seen, it has seemed that I was dependent on J in construed,
the similarity of Gen. XII 10-20 and XXVI to Gen. XX, of
Gen. XVI to Gen. XXI 9-21, of Gen. XXV 29-34 to Gen. XXVII
1-40, and the similarity of the different accounts of the
J and E narratives in chapters XXVII, XXX, XXXI, and
XXXVII of Genesis seem it most very probable that this
hypothesis is correct. Familiarity in this line then
it is also observed that great care is taken of J to
correct the records of Jahwe's narratives which seem

1. Deut. vide Derwellies, p. 111; cf. also Kautzsch.

2. M. Lopez, Lessons, in Sacral. Sig., vol. II, p.
590. Their attention is pointed, with considerable
of an older tradition in the J document.

offensive to his taste. It seems, therefore, probable that the Elohist writer had at his disposal the J document and tradition circulating freely in the nation of Israel where was his home. He did not set out to edit the earlier work in the vein of editors of later times, but instead he rewrote the epic, often completely transforming it, and adding to it material which he considered too valuable to neglect. His resulting work was no servile reproduction of J, but an epic eminently suited to his own day and age.

CHAPTER III

J^1, L, or S

Since the discovery by critics that the Pentateuch is not a unified work of Moses, but contains the writings of four different men, J, E, D, and P, much labor has been expended to account for composite elements within the strand characterized throughout by the use of the name Yahweh. The greatest difficulty is found within sections of Genesis. The bulk of the non-P material in Gen. I-XI, the Urgeschichte, is usually attributed to J, yet evidences of composition are many within these chapters.[1] In the creation and paradise story of Gen. II and III the mention of the tree of life in II 9 and III 22,24, and the description of the land of Eden and its rivers in II 10-14 are thought to be not cognate to the rest of the chapters. In Gen. IV, verses 1-15, which tell of Cain's conflict with Abel and the resulting curse laid upon Cain, disagree with verses 16-24, which present a list of Cain's descendants and show him to be the father of all culture. In disagreement also with the greater part of the Yahwistic material in the preceding chapters is IV 25 f. which maintains that only with the birth of Enosh did men begin to worship Yahweh. In the story of the flood in chapters VI-VIII so many

1. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 140 ff.

CHAPTER III

ϕ_1^1, Σ_1, and S

Since the statement by critics that the symbolism is not a unique work of genius, but contains the influence of four different men, Σ, ϕ, Ω, and Ψ, has been accepted as an usual for appropriate elements which the linear characteristics transmuted by the use of the same. The analytic difficulty in comparative study of textual the bulk of the non-material in Chap. I-XII, can

<u>Correspondence</u>, in some or attributes to Σ_1, and attempts to conceptualize are easy within these chapters. In the creation and response style of Chap. II and the analysis of the theme of life in II 8 and III 28,-1, and the description of our land of Joab and its rivers in II 1-14 are closer to not concrete to the kind of the complex. In Chap. IV, verses I-II, which tell of Saul's conflict with God and the resulting curse I-III cross this. Together with verses 10-24, which present a list of Saul's descendants and also to be the father of all mankind. In other words and with the creation part of the Yahwistic material in the preceding chapters in IV 25 Σ_1, which mentions Cain only with the birth of Abel and then again to varnish Cain. In the story of the flood in chapters VI-VIII is also

1. Holzinger, <u>Genesis</u>, p. 140 ff.

obscurities and repetitions occur that Mr. Paul Romanoff in the Journal of Biblical Literature for 1931 has concluded[1] that not only J and P, but also a third version which he calls M is present in the biblical text at that point. Gen. IX 20-27 presents a picture of Noah and his sons which is very different from that of the flood narrative. And the ethnological table found in parts of Gen. X is likewise not to be connected with Gen. XI 1-9, since it presupposes the existence of Babel in the days of Nimrod, whereas Gen. XI 1-9 tells of the founding of the city in a later time, as the result of the direct interposition of Yahweh. In later sections of Genesis, likewise, there are inconsistencies which make it impossible to ascribe all of the material usually considered J to one writer. Chief of these incongruous sections are chapters XXXIV and XXXVIII, the former the story of Dinah and Shechem, and the latter the story of Judah and Tamar. Chapter XXXIV contains at least two strands of material, the origin of both of which is debatable. Its connection with the preceding and following material is unsatisfactory, and its assumption that the sons of Jacob dwelt amid the Canaanitish inhabitants of the land is contrary to J's usual notions. The contemplation of marriage between Canaanites and Israelites is totally contrary to the

1. Romanoff, A Third Version of the Flood Narrative, in JBL, 1931, p. 304 ff.

principles of J (cf. Gen. XXIV). Its maladjustment, likewise, to the chronology of the rest of J shows it to be unsuited to the J document. Joseph and his brothers are mere boys when he is sold into Egypt (Gen. XXXVII), yet before that, according to Gen. XXXIV, Dinah had been violated and Simeon and Levi had put all the inhabitants of Shechem to the sword. The obvious antiquity and historical value of this chapter, however, make it difficult for critics to assign it to any of the main strands of the Pentateuch other than J. Likewise Gen. XXXVIII[1] is a narrative which interrupts the connection between the incidents of the Joseph story. According to J the sons of Jacob are still unmarried when they go to Egypt.[2] Gen. XXXVIII, on the other hand, tells a story of the marriage of Judah and his sons, which would indicate either that this son of Jacob, so prominent in J's account of Joseph and his brethren in Egypt, was old enough to be a grandfather before he left the land of Canaan or that he never left Canaan at all. It is also unlike the Yahwistic author to mention the custom of sacred prostitution. For these reasons this chapter cannot be assigned satisfactorily to the main strand of J; and nevertheless, because of its

1. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 204.

2. Cf. E's narrative in XLII 37 with that of J in XLIII 9, XLIV 32.

elements of great antiquity, people find it hard to assign it to E, D, or P.

Scholars have offered various solutions for these problems arising within J. According to one hypothesis the J strand is the product of a school of writers working with a common purpose, imitating the style of a leader who has been termed J^1. The subsequent hands that have been recognized by critics have been called respectively J^2 and J^3. Budde in Die biblische Urgeschichte is the outstanding exponent of this prominent theory. In somewhat modified form Gunkel has also presented the same view, and it has heretofore been accepted very widely as the most satisfactory solution of the difficulties involved.[1]

In 1922 Eissfeldt turned in another direction to meet these difficulties. In his Hexateuch-Synopse he attempted to show that there are two sources within the Hexateuch, each of which presents peculiar characteristics which hitherto have not been recognized by critics. With a recognition of the separateness of the two sources, which he calls L and J, Eissfeldt contends that the majority of

1. Brightman, The Sources of the Hexateuch, p. 19 ff. Carpenter and Harford, Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 192 ff. Cornill, Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, p. 85 ff. Geden, Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, p. 351 f. Gray, A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 43 f. Holzinger, op. cit., p. 146 ff. Kautzsch, An Outline of the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 37 f. McFadyen, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 73 f. Moore, The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 41 ff.

the problems which previously suggested to critics that a school of writers was at work disappear.

Working along a similar line, but confining himself to Genesis, Professor Pfeiffer in the Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft for 1930 likewise presented the theory that two sources should be recognized in the material usually attributed to J in Genesis. His analysis differs very much from that of Eissfeldt, and his conception of the origin and relation of this non-J material to the rest of the Pentateuch is entirely different from that of his predecessor, for he considers it a non-Israelitic work included with the rest of the Pentateuchal writings at a late date in Israelitish history; yet his conclusion, positing a greater number of sources within the Pentateuch than had previously been recognized, is in that respect so similar to that of Eissfeldt that both works mark a different phase of Pentateuchal criticism.

In the consideration of the problems which these scholars are attempting to solve, and in the entire study of the source J, the present writer has been influenced by three considerations. In the first place, there has been often too little appreciation of the ability of the author of J and of the unity of his masterpiece. Secondly, the methods of the compilers of the narratives should be constantly borne in mind, and when differences from their usual procedure occur, notice should be taken of these

variations and explanations should be sought. Thirdly, the interest of the deuteronomic writers in this material should be recognized, and constant watch should be kept for additions and revisions from their hands. These points, of course, are accepted, at least in part, by the majority of critics, yet a proper appreciation of their importance will, the writer believes, bring somewhat different results in a determination of the nature and extent of the J source.

In a closer examination of the theory that J is the product of a school of writers, the work of Budde and Gunkel will be taken for consideration. Budde maintains in his study of the Urgeschichte that at the basis of Gen. I-XI stands the work of one man, J^1:[1] His work comprised II 4b, 5-9, 16-25, III 1-19, 21, VI 3, III 23, IV 1, 2bβ, 16b, 17-24, VI 1, 2, 4, X 9, XI 1-9, IX 20-27, thus a story of the creation of man and the garden of Eden, the birth of Cain and his descendants, the birth of the giants, the tower of Babel, and the story of Noah and his sons. In this there was no mention of the tree of life, of the quarrel between Cain and Abel, nor of the flood. The first and last of these sections, together with the birth of Seth (IV 25),[2]

1. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, p. 522 ff.

2. Ibid., p. 154 ff.

the naming of Noah (V 29)[1], the birth of Noah's sons (IX 18,19)[2], and those parts of the ethnological table in chapter X[3] which are not P, Budde assigns to a man whom he calls J^2. This writer, he supposes, worked with a knowledge of J^1, because he desired to revise and improve his account. Both of these Yahwistic writings, Budde thinks, were in their turn revised and combined by a third member of the school who can conveniently be called J^3. The work of J^3 can be seen in revisions of IV 25 and in IV 1-15 which he fabricated to account for the side-tracking of Cain's descendants in favor of those of Seth, as told in the narrative of the flood.

This attempted solution of Budde's, which many have hailed as offering adequate explanation of the perplexing problems, by no means solves all the difficulties in the Urgeschichte. Budde's J^2 is so fragmentary that it is difficult to be sure that it once was a connected source. It can readily be seen that the remnants of chapters II and III which go to constitute his story of the creation and the garden of Eden could as easily be

1. Budde, op. cit., p. 168 ff.
2. Ibid., p. 304.
3. Ibid., p. 390.

attributed to a redactor as to an important narrative writer. The only connected portion of this section which we have is found in II 10-15; and as Professor Pfeiffer has said,[1] "the pedantic and absurd information about the four rivers flowing from Eden (2^{10-15}), so akin to the dull prattle of an uninteresting cicerone, is just the sort of thing that an ignorant scribe would feel impelled to add to a text." The birth of Seth and the preservation of his seed after the devastating flood constitute a narrative of J^2 which at first appears to be logically connected, yet IV 25 has undergone a revision, and the story of the flood in chapters VI-VIII is at present greatly confused. Budde makes the following attempt to secure some order from the mixture:[2] VI 5, 6, 7*, 8, VII 1, 2, 3b, 4, 5, 10, 7*, 16b, 12, 17b, 22*, 23*, VIII 6a, 2b, 3a, 6b, 7, 8*, 9-12, 13b, 20-22. It may be questioned whether, when the original narrative is determined, any connection will be found between these sections. The connecting verse in our text is V 29, which, according to Budde (p. 168 f.), belongs to J's list of Seth's descendants, part of which is at present found in IV 25, 26. On pages 307-313, however, Budde is equally as clear that it has a close connection with IX 20-27, a section which he concludes belongs to the

1. Pfeiffer, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, in ZAW, 1930, p. 68.

2. Budde, op. cit., p. 276.

earliest strand, J^1. IV 25, 26 do not at present, therefore, furnish a smooth transition from the story of the creation to that of the flood. Only the necessities of the theory make it so. Doubtless a story of the flood once existed from which an editor took the material which Budde has singled out in chapters VI-VIII and reworked with the contradictory and confusing material now found in the non-P portions of the chapters. That this story formed part of a unified narrative, more of which is present in Gen. I-XI and which runs parallel to a floodless Urgeschichte, as Budde supposes, is not indicated by the surrounding material. In chapter X 8-19, 21, 24-30 is an ethnological table which is assigned by Budde to J^2. As it stands it is very complex, and Budde admits that it has been much revised. It has no present connection with the previously discussed "J" narrative, but follows material unanimously assigned to P. Its connection with the flood story Budde finds in the preceding chapter, vv. 18, 19,which now introduce vv. 20-27, but which cannot have done so originally if Budde is correct in his theory that these latter verses belonged to a strand which was ignorant of the story of the flood. The connection between IX 18, 19 and X 8 ff. is by no means satisfactory, however, for neither Cush, Mizraim, nor Canaan is mentioned in the former verses. That a section similar to that of P once joined the two, making the story of the flood complete, is an unsupported hypothesis. X 8-19, 21, 24-30 might

earlier strata, cf. IV 2c. It do not at present, therefore, include a parallel treatment from the story of the creation to that of the flood. Only the mysteriously of the history made it so. Possibly a study of the flood myth relative to which an entire book has material which stands out in chapters VI-VIII and connected with the contradictory and remaining material has found in the sections of the chapters. That this study leaves part of a unified narrative, some of which is present in gen. I-II can which can be detailed in a discussion "Pre-existing", as shown, to not indicated by the mythological material. In chapter I 2-19, 20, 24-30 is an etymological table which is shown by Dahse to 3. As it stands it is very complex, the same points that it has been much revised. It has no present connection with the previously discussed "I" material, but follows material chronologically subjoined to it. The connection with the flood story Dahse first in the preceding chapter, vv. 1b, 1c which has introduce vv. 20-27, but which cannot have done so originally if Dahse is correct in his theory that these little verses belonged to a strong which was important of the story of the flood. The connection between IX 18, 20 and I 2 ff. is by no means satisfactory, however, for Noah's three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet is mentioned in the former verses. That a section similar to that of I 2 once joined the two, making the story of the flood complete, is an unsupported hypothesis. I 2-19, 21, 24-30 might

equally well be an editorial "compilation[1] prepared by a learned exegete."

The hand of J^3 Budde sees in revisions appearing frequently throughout the chapters. The most developed section for which he believes him responsible is the story of Cain's murder of Abel in IV 1-15. This he supposes[2] him to have composed with both J^1 and J^2 before him, to explain why the descendants of Cain, enumerated in the list in J^1, were overthrown, and only the descendants of Seth, designated in the list of J^2 as the sole survivors of the flood, were recipients of Yahweh's favor. These verses, however, do not merely serve this purpose, but they present the story to which IV 24 (J^1) alludes. In spite of its late elements are we to suppose that its relation to this verse, as Budde in chapter VI indicates, is as an explanation of an otherwise obscure allusion? A story such as this must have been known to the man who wrote vv. 16-24, and an author of the ability which J shows in the rest of the Hexateuch would not have left such a gap in his finished epic.

It is not possible, then, to say with assurance that the non-P material of Gen. I-XI can be simply divided

1. Pfeiffer, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, in ZAW, 1930, p. 68.

2. Budde, op. cit., pp. 208 f., 247.

possibly will be an editorial "compilation prepared by a learned scribe."[1]

The work of J^6 Bruce does in reviewing frequently throughout the chapters. The most developed section for which he believes him responsible is the story of Cain's murder of Abel in IV 1-12. There he supposes him to have composed with both J^4 and J^5 before him, to explain why the descendants of Cain, enumerated in the list in J^4, were overthrown, and only the descendants of Seth, designated in the list of J^5 as the sole survivors of the flood, were recipients of Yahweh's favor. These terms, however, do not merely serve this purpose, but they present the story to which IV 25 (2) alludes. In spite of its late elements are we to suppose that its relation to this verse, as Smith in Chapter VI indicated, is an outcrossing of an originally concrete allusion? A story such as this was hardly foreign to the man who wrote xx. 12-21, and as author of the editing which I assume in the text of the Pentateuch would not have left such a gap in his finished sign.

It is not possible, then, to say with assurance what the man-i material of Gen. I-XI can be simply divided

1. Pfeiffer, A Non-Jahwistic Source of the Book of Genesis, in JAOS, 1920, p. 48.

2. Budde, op. cit., xx. 2001.247.

into two strands (J^1 and J^2) culminating in the stories of the tower of Babel and of the flood respectively. While there may possibly have been a connected series of legends such as Budde describes J^2 to have been, the existing fragments woven around the earlier material are not such as to demand this conclusion.

To turn to another aspect of these chapters; whereas in Gen. XII-L the P material is fragmentary and has obviously been added either by the priestly author himself or a redactor who worked using the JE material as a basis, in the Urgeschichte a precisely opposite procedure is followed. P is preserved almost complete and the other strand is fitted in fragmentary form around it. This situation is emphasized by Professor Pfeiffer in A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis wherein he maintains that P in Genesis was an introduction and commentary, and no separate literary document. Whether or not his conclusions on this latter point are accepted, his observation that the process of combination of material varies strikingly in these sections of narrative is worthy of the closest attention. As he says (p. 67), 50 per cent of the material in I-XI is P, whereas in XII-L P is not more than 20 per cent of J. In the flood story and ethnological table (chap. X) it is particularly clear that the "J" material was added to P, "but throughout 1-11 'J' is made up of fragments abruptly thrust into the well woven

into the grooves (T_1 and T_2) corresponding to the surface of the tower on Grand Cay or the Cabo Frances/Isabela. While there may possibly have been a conspicuous series of legends such as Bowen describes T_1 in prior time, the existing fragments were around the earlier m.berial are not used as to demand this connotation.

To turn to another aspect of these analyses: varves in Gen. III-E can f material in frequentary and has continuity been seen either by the geologist author itself or a technicer was worked using the [illegible] as a basis. In fact, [illegible] a reasonably opposite procedure is followed. I is [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] which [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible] it. This situation is summarized in Fredenhe [illegible] in A Pre-[illegible] Series of the Book of Jonah where [illegible] maintains that I in Genesis was an introduction and conclusion, and so separate literary [illegible]. Whether or not his conclusions on this latter point are accepted, his observation that the process of combination of material series especially in these conditions of antiquity is [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible]. As he says [illegible], 30 per cent of the material in I-II is E, whereas in III-E E is not more than 20 per cent of J. On the [illegible] [illegible] chronological table (Long, 2) in a particularly clear [illegible] "E" material [illegible] in E, which [illegible] [illegible] is made up of [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

fabric of P." It does not seem probable that a redactor who preferred the JE stories of Gen. XII-L would lay aside that early and therefore revered book for the P material in the first few chapters. A more plausible suggestion would seem to be that the non-P sections of I-XI did not form a part of JE, but were combined with the Genesis material either after P, or at the same time as that document, in a narrative the basis of which was J, E, and P.

But not only is Budde's theory unconvincing in its attempt to simplify the complicated chapters of the Urgeschichte; and not only does his assumption that the material which he is studying is J seem doubtful because of the procedure of the redactor; further evidence of the want of resemblance to J can be seen in a comparison of these sections and the J material of Gen. XII-L in the matter of a) literary structure and style, b) mood, and c) religion. The best discussion of these points is to be found in the article above referred to, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, by R. H. Pfeiffer, and from there the following is largely derived. a) Whereas the epic of J is unified, with a dominating idea linking the narratives in an unbroken sequence of cause and effect, the non-P material of Gen. I-XI presents merely a series of stories in chronological order, lacking in epic breadth

and in organic relation with one another.[1] The incidents in J are told with a wealth of imaginative detail and poetic feeling; but in the non-P stories of Gen. I-XI the style is concise and matter-of-fact. Emotional richness is to be found in the narratives of J, but is lacking in the early chapters of Genesis. Contrasting with the pathos of J's tragedies (cf. Gen. XLIII) is the brutality of such scenes as the murder of Abel and the cursing of Cain (Gen. IV 1-15), or Lamech's song of vengeance (Gen. IV 23 f.). The refinement and delicacy of touch observable everywhere in the compositions of J likewise reveal the difference between this source and the primitive crudity (Gen. IX 20-27) of the author of the other chapters. b) In mood these sections of Genesis are very different. The stories of J present an idyllic life, peaceful, charming, untouched by war, rape, and violence. Disagreements in J are discussed, wit matching wit, and are finally settled by formal covenants (Gen. XII, XXVI, XXXI, XXXIII). In Gen. I-XI the mood is pessimistic and bitter. Mankind is under a curse which demands unceasing, distasteful toil (Gen. III). Woman is particularly despised and considered inferior to man. Violence is prominent (Gen. IV); even the divine beings stoop to wickedness (Gen. VI 1-4). As Professor Pfeiffer has said,[2] the J material

1. Note the preceding discussion of the lack of good connection between the sections of Budde's sources.

2. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 71.

of Gen. XII-L is truly a "Paradise Regained," the non-P material of Gen. I-XI a "Paradise Lost." c) J's religion centers in one national god, the sole god for Israel to worship, who is concerned for no other nation. In the sections of Gen. I-XI, on the other hand, Yahweh is not particularly interested in Israel nor in any other nation. He is jealous of all mankind, and fearful that men may usurp the deity's prerogatives. Punishment follows swiftly upon any crime. Such a deity arouses fear and not confidence. Whereas in J a conspicuous trait is the avoidance of ritual in connection with worship, and the substitution therefor of frequent prayer, in Gen. IV the story hinges on the respective value of the nomad's and the agriculturalist's offerings, and in Gen. VIII 20 ff. Noah's burntofferings are said to have purchased Yahweh's favor.

Probably the most potent argument for the attribution of both the non-P material of Gen. I-XI and the J material of Gen. XII-L to one source is that the vocabularies of the two are very similar.[1] As far as the employment of Yahweh is concerned, a priori there seems to be no reason why two or more writers should not have held the theory of the author of J that Yahweh had been worshipped from time immemorial. The author of the non-P

1. It has been said above that it can no longer be maintained that the literary styles of both coincide.

sections of Gen. I-XI need not on that account have been the same as the author of the Yahwistic material in Gen. XII-L. Other words, likewise, which appear more frequently in those sections than in other portions of the Hexateuch may be explained in two ways: possibly both were written in the south of Palestine where a different set of colloquialisms existed from that found in the north where E was written (cf. Ju. XII 5, 6); or possibly the non-P material of Gen. I-XI formed part of a source used by the author of J who naturally incorporated in his work words frequent in his material. This last suggestion will be developed further in the following chapter.

In agreement with much that Budde has written, Professor Hermann Gunkel also adheres to the theory that J is the product of a school of writers; but he carries this position to a greater extreme. Convinced that in the Urgeschichte evidences of at least two compilers of legends can be recognized, as Budde has shown, he carries the study further and shows[1] that within the cycle of Abraham legends, particularly in the story of Lot, in the sanctuary stories in the Jacob, Esau, Laban cycle, in the sagas of the individual sons of Jacob, and in the account of Joseph's agrarian policy the work of several hands can

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. LVII f.

be distinguished. He notes that in the Urgeschichte there is[1] little connection between the stories, in contrast to the unity in the other parts of Genesis. From this observation he draws no conclusion concerning the possibly different origin of the sections. His attention is centered on the fact that where the connection is poor a mere compilation of originally disconnected stories is to be inferred. He decides[2] that no individual author is composing a unified epic. The symbol J stands for a process continued over a period of time. Beginning with isolated legends transmitted orally, several of which are combined in a connected story, this in its turn being supplemented by other tales, and joined with similarly constructed narrative cycles, our source J grew, not the product of an individual mind, nor even of a redactor who compiled the legends. The contribution of individual hands is of little concern, for each varies but little from the others. Rather is this a product of a narrative school which slowly compiled our present epic. The work of Gunkel on J in Genesis is an advance over that of Budde because he carries his study of the strand usually considered J into other portions of the book than the Urgeschichte, and

1. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 2.

2. Ibid., p. LV ff.

recognizes in the later sections of the narrative similar difficulties to what had been observed in the earlier chapters. He has taken herein, however, an extreme position. Blinded by the lack of unity in Gen. I-XI and by the disparate elements found within the "J" material of Gen. XII-L he fails to recognize the underlying unity of most of "J," and categorically denies it to the epic. If he had had a keener realization of J's ability, as shown within the cleverly interwoven strands of part of the epic, and an appreciation of the height of J's narrative powers when he adapts his sources to disclose effectively the value of the Israelitish fathers, Gunkel might have considered it necessary to search for other possible explanations of the difficulties which he so clearly sees. He might likewise have found the difference between the connected narrative of Gen. XII-L and the disconnected series of anecdotes in the Urgeschichte so great that he could not easily class these portions of the text together.

An attempted solution in another direction has been offered by Professor Otto Eissfeldt. Abandoning the presumption of the older critics that with the separation of the Hexateuch into four strands, J, E, D, and P, the main sources have been discovered, he calls attention to the presence of compound narratives within the so-called J strand, complexities which have long been recognized, but

which he feels have received too little attention. He points out, for example, the parallel stories of Abram in Egypt (Gen. XII 10-20) and Isaac in Gerar (Gen. XXVI); Abram's discovery of the sacrednees of Bethel (Gen. XII 8) and Jacob's later discovery of Yahweh's presence in that spot (Gen. XXVIII); the promise to Abram twice repeated, in Gen. XIII and again in XV; the presence of a double strand of narrative in Gen. XVIII; the similar situation in the story of Lot and the angels in the chapter immediately following (Gen. XIX); the two stories of Jacob's attempt to win the right of the first-born-- by purchasing it with a bowl of lentil soup (Gen. XXV 29-34), and by winning through deceit his father's blessing (Gen. XXVII). Other illustrations of duplicated narratives he finds throughout the epic. For the purpose of the present chapter those already given will suffice. On the basis of doublets such as these Eissfeldt divides J into two sources, J and L. Of these, L, standing for Lay Source, is the earlier in date[1]; and J is dependent for his work upon it. The date of these sources is somewhat uncertain, but in all probability L comes from the time of Elijah and J from the first half of the eighth century. A discussion and comparison of these two sources is difficult because Eissfeldt never gives a detailed account

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 7 ff., 85.

of their characteristics. Material for such a discussion has to be obtained from scattered remarks in the introduction to his synopsis. As the older source, L shows greater signs of antiquity.[1] His is the narrower view of the world and of world affairs. When the sons of Noah are listed in L they are said to be fathers of three Palestinian peoples (Gen. IX 21-27); the sons of Noah in J are fathers of all the people in the world (Gen. IX 18, 19). Likewise in his narrative of Isaac at Gerar (Gen. XXVI) L shows himself to be older than J, for the latter's story of Abram in Egypt (Gen. XII 10-20) presupposes a knowledge of more distant lands and a wider experience with the world. In the earlier time in which L was written the nomadic life of a former day seemed close at hand and very desirable.[2] In correspondence with this, L distrusted the civilization of the land of Canaan and regretted its acceptance by the Israelitish people. The acquisition of this land was not to him a proof of divine favor, and a continuance of the life at the sacred mount seemed much more desirable. Such a feeling on the part of L calls to mind the ideals of Jehonadab ben Rechab, an active reactionary at the time of Elijah and Elisha (II Kings X 15, 16). J, on the other hand, is interested in the

1. Eissfeldt, Hexateuch-Synopse, pp. 8, 12.
2. Ibid., pp. 8, 58 f.

of their observations. Belief for over a millennium
has to be obtained from scattered remarks in the Ineffa-
bilis by his Annexis. As the older sources, I cannot
[illegible] claim of originality. His is the narrower view of
the world and of world affairs. Then the sons of God
are listed in I Enoch are said to be fathers of three
antediluvian peoples (Gen. XX 22-27): the sons of Noah in
I are fathers of all the people in the world (Gen. IX 18,
19). Likewise in his narrative of Isaac at Gerar (Gen.
XXVI) I seems himself to be older than J, for the patriarch's
story of Abram in Egypt (Gen. XII 10-20) presupposes a
knowledge of more distant lands and a wider experience
with the world. In the earlier time in which I was written
the nomadic life of a former day seemed more at home and
very desirable. In correspondence with this I discussed
the civilization of the land of Canaan and reported its
acceptance by the Israelitish people. The acquisition of
this land was not to him a great of divine favor, and a
continuance of the life of the desert seemed much
more desirable. Such a feeling on the part of I will be
seen the idea of Jehonadab ben Rechab, a zealot
reactionary at the time of Ahab and Elijah (II Kings
X 15, 16). J, on the other hand, is interested in the

7. Eichhorn, Einleitung-Gunkel, op. c, 12.

8. Ibid., op. c, 12 f.

agricultural life of the people of Canaan. The conquest of the land brings joy to him, and he delights in the political power assured by possession of the country. In this source is seen the national-religious patriotism so prevalent in the nation that Amos and Isaiah were roused to protest against it. Yahweh is the source of the people's blessings, and Yahweh insures their continued prosperity. The ethnological element is prominent in the narratives of L.[1] Early in the story of Jacob (the struggle at Penuel, Gen. XXXII) there comes the change of name to Israel, and thenceforth the tribal name is employed, although the individual remains of chief interest for some time longer and the sons of subordinate importance. In J, however, an interest in biography is evident. The historical background becomes obscure, and the individual figures come to prominence. In a comparison of the style of J and L, Eissfeldt finds the narratives of L loosely connected, less compactly bound together than those of either J or E. In the narratives of J the stories of the heroes' exploits are well woven together; under his pen "Die Stammessage ist zur Familien-Novelle geworden."[2]

While, as has been said above, it is difficult to appraise correctly the work of Eissfeldt because of his

1. Eissfeldt, op. cit., pp. 18 f., 87.

2. Ibid., p. 87.

failure to discuss at length the sources which are the result of his investigation, it is clear that Pentateuchal criticism will gain much of value from his work. Possibly his greatest contribution is the demonstration that there are other possible explanations of the difficulties within J than the one so long accepted by biblical critics. No longer must the narrative ability of this epic writer be overlooked; it can be recognized while the inharmonious elements are likewise appreciated.

None the less, Eissfeldt's conclusions are not without their difficulties. When the parallel columns of text are examined with the purpose of studying the sources thus presented it appears that J is far less of a masterpiece than before this further division was made. Whereas in such chapters as Gen. XVIII and XXIX 1-14 the text presents a story of imaginative beauty and charm, told with an amount of lifelike details that would prove the author an able story-teller, in the separate sources as Eissfeldt has analyzed them much of the charm has been lost in the process of dissection. The master workman is now shown to have been the redactor, a story-teller unsurpassed in the world. Likewise in the skilful combination of the stories the same criticism of Eissfeldt's work applies. The outstanding characteristic of J which had previously been observed was his ability to interweave his incidents in an unbroken sequence of cause and effect. Now, while

certain sections of Eissfeldt's J still exhibit that characteristic, as the Joseph story, for example, in many others the dramatic development is the work of the redactor, not the product of the Yahwistic narrator. Compare in this respect the picture of Abraham, who in our text is presented as the favored of Yahweh, magnanimous to the point of disregarding the future promised him by Yahweh if by so doing he can keep the friendship of Lot. As a result of his nobility of spirit Yahweh showers on him blessings, while in his turn Lot's wealth is entirely wiped out. Such is the well planned narrative of chapters XII, XIII, XVIII, XIX in the text usually attributed to J. According to Eissfeldt's division Lot's name does not appear in J until the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. The preparation for this incident is omitted in J. At this point, since the traits of character in Lot which cause his disaster are presented in L, that source seems better constructed than J. Less attention, however, is paid to the reward of Abraham in L. Only a few verses are devoted to this subject, so interesting to an Israelitish reader, whereas the punishment of Lot is developed at considerable length. Only J elaborates upon this section. The proper balance between these narratives seems to be produced by the skilful hand of the redactor. And yet it is not really to be supposed that the redactor who combined J and L was a greater master

of the narrative art than either of his sources, since he reproduced the wording of the two texts substantially as he found them.

In his zeal to separate fully the two strands of narrative, L and J, in the many places where compilation is evident in the text, Eissfeldt has neglected many other difficulties found in the material which is usually attributed to J. The result is that the text of the newly delimited sources is little more consistent than the original J. Since he follows Budde to a great extent in his analysis of the Urgeschichte, the inconsistencies which, as has been mentioned above, appear in any connection of parts of these chapters with the J material following are found in the sources L and J. His work offers no assistance in removing these difficulties. In literary style, mood, and religion all of the early material of Gen. I-XI contrasts with the J strand of Gen. XII-L. Not only in the Urgeschichte, however, but also in the rest of the J source contradictory elements occasionally appear. Such, for example, is J's attitude toward the cult. J shows an insistent desire to avoid reference to all ritual, even where the circumstances would lead him naturally to mention it. All commentators have observed this characteristic of the source. Compare, for example, Isaac's erection of an altar and his immediately following prayer, not sacrifice (Gen. XXVI 25). Yet in spite of this striking

peculiarity of J's, Eissfeldt attributes to him, not only in the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV and VIII), but also in Gen. XV and Ex. XXXIV a description of the command of Yahweh himself that burnt offerings be sacrificed to him. Eissfeldt has failed to recognize the hand of the deuteronomist in frequent portions of his J source. Examples of this are plainly evident: compare Ex. XXIII 22b-24 wherein is mentioned the angel who is to bring the people to the land of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Canaanites, Hivites, and Jebusites; in Ex. XXXIII 1-3a a similar reference is found, and the land is described with the deuteronomic phrase "the land of milk and honey;" and again in Ex. XXXIV 11 a list of peoples such as always delights the deuteronomists is attributed to the J writer. Within the L source the greatest inconsistency appears in the serious gap between the stories of the sons of Jacob in Palestine and the narrative of the children of Israel in Egypt. According to the stories of Gen. XXXIV and XXXVIII the sons of Jacob settled in Canaan. L is entirely missing in the Joseph narrative, which, according to Eissfeldt, never formed a part of this source. How did L account for the change of scene to Egypt? A journey to this country on the part of the immediate sons of Jacob would seem, according to Gen. XXXIV and XXXVIII, to be not only unmentioned, but also excluded, since Gen. XXXVIII presupposes the lapse of a long period of time and a permanent

peculiarity of Ts, Disraeli attributes to him, not only in the Dramatisations (Con. IV and VIII), but also in Ben. XV and Ex. XXIV a description of the commons of Yahweh himself that bears strikings be assimilated to him.

Disraeli has failed to recognize the hand of the dramatisation in frequent portions of his J source. Examples of this are plainly evident: compare Ex. XXIII 20b-24 wherein is mentioned the angel who is to bring the people to the land of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Canaanites, Hivites, and Jebusites; to Ex. XXXIII 1-3a a similar reference is found, and the land is described with the dramatic phrase "the land of milk and honey;" and again in Ex. XXXIV 11 a list of peoples such as always mentions the Canaanites is attributed to the J writer. Within the J source the greatest inconsistency appears in the serious and between the stories of the sons of Jacob in Palestine and the narrative of the condition of Israel in Egypt. According to the stories of Gen. XXXV and XXXVIII the sons of Jacob settled in Canaan. I is entirely misleading in the Joseph narrative, which, according to Disraeli, never formed a part of this source. How did I account for the change of scene to Egypt? A journey to his country on the part of the immediate sons of Jacob would seem, according to Gen. XXXV and XXXVIII, be an act easily accomplished, but also excluded, since Gen. XXXVIII presupposes the lapse of a long period of time and a movement

establishment in Canaan. To L Eissfeldt likewise attributes Ex. XXXII 25-29, a section dealing with the able work of the Levitical priesthood; yet to this writer, according to Gen. XXXIV, the sons of Levi are a tribe descended from Jacob, as the other Israelitish tribes, and not the professional body of priests known to the deuteronomic and priestly writers and before them in Ju. XVII-XXI.

Eissfeldt himself (p. 84) recognizes that corrections and improvements will be made on the minutiae of division of sources; so the fact that errors in this respect can be detected here and there does not necessarily undermine the validity of his fundamental position. Two of these errors, however, may well be noted here.[1] In Ex. XII 33 Eissfeldt finds a source different from the surrounding material, and decides that it must be L. In chap. X 29 and XI 8 it has been said that Moses should not see Pharaoh's face again. In the material surrounding this one verse in chap. XII, however, Pharaoh himself comes to Moses to charge the Israelites to depart. In accordance with the earlier material this one verse must stand out, a portion of the new source L. It is important to notice, however, that the error in Eissfeldt's argument comes in the fact that Ex. X 29 and XI 8 are both attributed by him to J.

1. Eissfeldt, op. cit., p. 34 f.

Similarly Jos. XXIV 2 is largely assigned to E, but one phrase therein Eissfeldt thinks shows the presence of L. This is the allusion to Terah, mentioned earlier only in Gen. XI 28-30. These latter verses are attributed by him to J.

In view of the fact that Eissfeldt's analysis results in two sources inferior to the strand usually considered J, thereby making of the redactor a greater writer than those whose work he successfully combined, and since inconsistencies are far from eliminated by Eissfeldt in the sequence of the epics L and J, it seems necessary to continue the search further, to discover whether a closer approach may be had to a solution of the difficulties offered by the complexity of J.

In 1930 a valuable contribution to the study of these difficulties in J was made by Professor Robert H. Pfeiffer in an article referred to above, A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, which appeared in the Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. In this article Professor Pfeiffer calls attention first to the relation between P and J in Genesis. Developing the idea that P in this first Pentateuchal book is an introduction and commentary to JED, he shows that it is therefore significant that while in chapters XII-L P has been added to JE, in chapters I-XI it has formed the basis to which the non-P material has been added. He then turns his attention to the Urgeschichte. The two strands which are so often separated here he maintains are not [1] two collections of stories culminating respectively

1. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 68.

in the accounts of the Tower of Babel and of the Flood, but one primeval history (J^1) and secondary material in fragmentary form added clumsily to J^1 or to P." Within this material the "Yahweh Elohim" bears evidence of redactional conflation. Originally throughout Elohim was used, which was afterwards supplemented by the divine name Yahweh in order to identify this anonymous god. The presence of the word Yahweh in this material does not, therefore, prove that it is to be identified with J. Furthermore, against the identification of J^1 with J, he states, serious objections can be raised. Not only does it seem to have been lacking in J when P added his comments to JE, as is to be inferred from the above, but it seems a priori unlikely that it ever formed a part of J since E, which follows J step by step, begins with Abraham. Non-Israelitic ideas are left in this material, which J, with his skill in rewriting his sources, would not have tolerated. Furthermore, a comparison of these sections with J reveals more differences between them than can be found to exist between J and E. The remainder of the article is then devoted to making this comparison and offering a new suggestion to account for the material which he discards from J. Similar to the non-P material of the Urgeschichte, not only in literary and religious characteristics and mood, but also in the fact that it is inserted within the JEDP narrative, are other chapters,

In the accounts of the Lamar or Grand are of the Tigua, but one primary bilator ($\frac{1}{2}$) and secondary relative in frequency just round directly to $\frac{1}{2}$ or $\frac{1}{4}$. Within this material the Yamasee Indian' many relations if exactness existing. Particularly interesting that data, using was effectively complemented by the dining room layout in order to identify this ceremonial rod. The pressure on the open Tigua is this material was not, therefore, proof that it is to be identified with C. Furthermore, neither the identification of C_1 with C, nor claims, various objections can be raised. Of only were it also to have been lacking in C when F added his tubercle to C. It is to be inferred from the above, but it seems a point worthy that it prior forms a part of 2 sides E, which follows F when by key, leading into Chicora. Non-Tiraqilla lines are left in this material. Hence C, with his with in searching his sources, would not have inserted. Furthermore, a comparison of these sections with C reveals many differences. Other lines can be found to exist between A and E. The resistance of the article is then defined by making his comparison and offering a new connection to account for the material which he discards from I. Similar to the non-E material of the Yamasee, not only in history and religious characteristics and wood, but also in the text that it is inserted within the Jimi m. relative, are other characteristics.

Gen. XIV, XIX 1-26, 30-38, XXXIV, XXXV, 5, 21 f., XXXVI 9-39, XXXVIII. To this newly isolated Genesis material Professor Pfeiffer gives the symbol S, standing for South or Seir. The chief ways in which S contrasts with J have been discussed above in the treatment of Budde's theory. In addition to the points referred to there Professor Pfeiffer mentions the sources used by the respective authors of the two bodies of material. J's sources, he thinks, were oral and drawn from two groups of tradition: Canaanitic and Israelitic. The former are represented by the sanctuary stories of J, in particular those of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; the latter tell of the prehistory of the Israelites, the fortunes of Ishmael, Esau, Jacob, and his sons. S, on the other hand, is derived from two different groups of sources: mythical lore and tribal traditions. No legends based on the worship at the Canaanitish shrines appear in the Urgeschichte or the sections of Gen. XII-L which have just been isolated for study. Even the tribal traditions appearing in this material are different in character, for they show a prominent ethnological interest, while in J an interest in men as individuals always predominates. The Edomitic origin of S Professor Pfeiffer believes is plain because of its lack of interest in northern Israelitic tribes and its unfriendliness to those of the south. Only Cain

and Edom are looked upon with favor, and the whole geographical center of interest is in the south, the homeland of these two men. Gen. XXXVI contains a genuine list of the kings of Edom in historical times. The similarity of S in Weltanschauung to the Book of Job, which he likewise considers Edomitic, goes to support his views still further. While this Edomitic literature began to influence Israel during the exile (cf. Ez. XXVIII 1-19, XXXII 27, Is. LIV 9, XLIII 27), he believes that S in its original form probably appeared in the time of Solomon. With subsequent accretions it was added to JEP by the final redactor of the Pentateuch who desired "to preserve all extant ancient material and thus make of the Pentateuch a corpus of Mosaic literature."[1]

In this article Professor Pfeiffer has made an important contribution to Pentateuchal criticism. Here for the first time has been recognized the important fact that the non-P Urgeschichte and other chapters to be found in the latter part of the book of Genesis have characteristics in common which absolutely distinguish them from J; and at the same time he has observed that it is in just these sections that the method of the Pentateuchal redactor has changed from his customary way of treating J. In thus isolating the material which he calls S, and leaving

1. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 73.

and Tudor are treated even with fervor, and the whole geographical border of interest is in the south, the homeland of Ulster (no see). Jon. UCCVT contains a genuine list of the kings of Ulster in mythical times. The similarity of 5 in Tuiliaccomhrac to the Scot of Jno. makes me believe contrary Doubtlic, Cook is support his views with further. Thus this Doomlis literature began to influence Israel during the early (cf. Ex. CCVIII 1-15, CXXII 27, Ps. 114 2, CLIV 27), he believes that i is its original form prominr appeared in ear time of solomon. With subsequent corrections it was added to TNT by the final redactor of the Deuteronomic and received its property. It extant ancient material and came [illegible] the Israelish a course of Jewish literature.[1]

In this article Professor Pfeiffer has made an important contribution to Pentateuchal criticism. Here for the first time has been recognized the important fact that the non-P [illegible] no other documents to be found in the latter part of the book of Genesis have characteristics in common which absolutely distinguish them from J; or if the same line by one discovers, such it is in fact hard evidence that the redactor of the Pentateuchal redactor has omitted from his customary way of treating J. In Exod. including the material which is called E, and leaving

1. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 74.

an epic which begins with Gen. XII and continues without the intrusion of Gen. XXXIV, XXXV 5, 21 f., and XXXVIII, a much more unified narrative is revealed to us, more worthy of a man who produced such a masterpiece as is found in Gen. XXIV.

In certain respects, however, Professor Pfeiffer's article does not seem to have given the correct solution of the problem. To many his insistence that P^g in Genesis was never an independent work, but merely an introduction and commentary to JED, which the priestly author used as the basis of his work, will seem so doubtful that it will prejudice them against his conclusions, for they will believe this point erroneous if the rest of P^g in the Pentateuch is taken into consideration. A decision on this point, however, does not really need to be reached to follow Professor Pfeiffer in his subsequent conclusions. If the variations in procedure in combining P with the rest of the material in Genesis are all attributed to the Pentateuchal redactor, the latter's decision to disregard the "S" material in favor of P when he usually preferred JED indicates far more about the nature of "S" than has generally been recognized.

The view that "S" is Edomitic in origin is by no means a proven conclusion. The occurrence of Yahweh within the chapters would be one opposing indication. While in the sections where Yahweh Elohim appears Pfeiffer may have

offered the correct explanation when he said that originally a polytheistic story stood there, which was subsequently adapted to Israelitish readers by the identification of the unnamed deity with their national god; in many other places Yahweh seems well suited to the context and no surface indications would suggest editorial tampering with the text. Such sections may be found in Gen. IV, in the non-P material of Gen. VII and VIII, Gen. IX 26, and Gen. XXXVIII. The name Yahweh here would seem to indicate composition by an Israelitish author.

It must be remembered also that during the course of Israelitish history which included the period of the formation and publication of the Pentateuch, hostility to Edom was very great. J's own hatred of the Edomites is demonstrated in the Jacob-Esau stories. Such books as Malachi and Obadiah show that the hatred of Judah for this people had not decreased in the post-exilic period. It is unlikely, then, that at about the time when Obadiah was written the Jewish people would knowingly add Edomitic traditions to the content of their authoritative law book. On the other hand, that "S" is Edomitic material which was so thoroughly assimilated at an early time that it seemed to the Jews of the fifth century B.C. to be of Israelitic origin is a possible hypothesis, but one which demands detailed demonstration.

The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. XLIX 2-27) Pfeiffer does not consider a part of S. He thinks, however, that

offered the poorest explanation when he said that originally a polytheistic song served there, which was subsequently adapted to Israelitish readers by the identification of the renamed deity with their national god: in many other places Yahweh seems well suited to the context and on careful inspection would appear editorial tampering with one text. Such evidence may be found in Gen. IV, in the non-P material of Gen. XII and VIII, Gen. IX 26, and Gen. XXVIII. The case Yahweh here would seem to indicate composition by an Israelitish author.

It must be remembered also that during the course of Israelitish history which included the period of the formation and application of the Pentateuch, monotheism to some had very great. It's own method of the Sumerian is accompanied to the Jacob-Esau stories. Such cases as Esther and Obadiah show that the issues of Judah for this people had not advanced in the post-exilic period. It is unlikely, then, that at about the time when Obadiah was written but Jewish people would monotheism and Christian expressions to the contrast of their authoritative law book. On the other hand, what "E" is authentic material which was so successfully assimilated it an early time that it seemed to the Jews at the fifth century B.C. to be of Israelitic origin in a possible hypothesis, but one which demands certain consideration.

The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. XLIX 2-27) Pfeiffer does not consider a part of J. He thinks, however, that

1.
it was drawn from an anthology and later added to the JEP narrative, as the Song of Deborah was inserted in the deuteronomic Book of Judges. The blessing of Jacob, however, is a very old Israelitish poem, for it pictures the fortunes of the various tribes of Israel. And yet within its contents (vv. 3-7) are references to stories very like Gen. XXXV 21 f., XXXIV, and XXXV 5. Must not the latter likewise be Israelitish tribal traditions?

Further difficulties in Professor Pfeiffer's theory can be found in particular sections of "S." In the story of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. XIX can be found characteristics closely resembling those of the non-P portions of the Urgeschichte; compare particularly Gen. XIX 30-38 and Gen. IX 20-27, the pessimism of the whole, the picture of the unfriendliness between Lot and his neighbors, and the intolerable barbarity of the latter. For these reasons Pfeiffer assigns the chapter to S, with the exception of v. 29 which is P, and vv. 27, 28 which he believes suffice to conclude the Abraham-Lot narrative in J. Yet it is to be noted that at this point the "S" material has not been added to P, for v. 29 presupposes the preceding vv. 1-26 of the chapter. Furthermore J in chapters XII and XIII had been at pains to prepare for a later description of Abraham's reward for his generous acts and Lot's eventual

1. Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 69.

punishment for his selfishness. Abraham's reward is delightfully described in the scene at the oaks of Mamre in Gen. XVIII. Are the two verses XIX 27, 28 sufficient to satisfy J's reader, concerning Lot's punishment? Is not at least XIX 1-28 demanded in the J source, and must not some other solution be sought of the presence of elements characteristic of "S" within J?

Another portion of "S" which arouses question is the story of Judah and Tamar in Gen. XXXVIII. The last four verses of that chapter tell of the birth of Pharez and Zarah, the point for which the whole of vv. 1-26 was a preparation. Yet here the phraseology of this chapter is so similar to that of the birth of Esau and Jacob in Gen. XXV 21-26 that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion of literary relationship between these sections. The parallel sequence of clauses as well as the use of the same phrases in both accounts would indicate either that both are from the same hand, or that one was written by a man who had the other before him. The following parallels will show this point:

Gen. XXV 24	וי מלאו ימיה ללדת והנה תומים בבטנה
Gen. XXXVIII 27	ויהי בעת לדתה והנה תאומים בבטנה
Gen. XXV 25b, 26aβ	ויקראו שמו עשו ..... ויקרא שמו יעקב
Gen. XXXVIII 29b, 30b	ויקרא שמו פרץ ..... ויקרא שמו זרח

And yet J is surely found in Gen. XXV 21-26, while Gen. XXXVIII is of such a nature that it is one of the most difficult chapters to assign to J.[1]

Other elements of complexity within J to which Eissfeldt calls particular attention in his work fall outside the scope of Professor Pfeiffer's investigation. That even Gen. XVIII is clearly of complex origin, or that the story of Penuel had a polytheistic basis are points which his theory does not attempt to explain.

In conclusion, in this study of the problem of the unity of J certain facts have become increasingly clear. Within the limits of the material usually considered J diverse elements can be observed which would not naturally be produced by the pen of one author. It has been suggested by Budde and Gunkel that they show J to have been composed by a school of writers. Budde has not been successful, however, in isplating two independent strands in the Urgeschichte as the work of the school, nor is it possible to associate any of the material in Gen. I-XI with the J of the rest of the Hexateuch. Gunkel is as unsuccessful in his work on the rest of Genesis. J's ability as an epic writer is so remarkable that it is impossible to consider him a mere reproducer of received traditions. The Yahwistic legends were not assembled by a school who left

1. Cf. its insertion into the text, the admission that Judah married one of the inhabitants of Canaan, the mention of sacred prostitution.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

no stamp of their individual personalities. Nor has Eissfeldt offered a convincing solution in his separation of material belonging to a fourth source. The attention of scholars has been legitimately called by him to an aspect of the situation previously too little considered. There is more complexity in the early material than critics have been accustomed to reflect upon. Nevertheless, Eissfeldt's analysis produces two sources inferior respectively to the narrative which is the result of their combination; and the anomalous situation which results, since the redactor must have been both subservient to others and at the same time an artistic genius, is enough to disprove the truth of the theory. It is further weakened by the realization of continued discrepancies within both documents. Pfeiffer has made a real advance in proving the impossibility of attributing the "S" material to the Yahwistic author. He has failed to note and account for certain connections between "S" and J, however, and he has not satisfactorily demonstrated the Edomitic origin of "S."

The task before Pentateuchal criticism now, therefore, is to construct a hypothesis adapted to these many difficulties. The desired hypothesis will probably include Professor Pfeiffer's conclusions that his "S" material is not to be identified with J. It will have to offer, however, some means of explaining a relationship between J and this material (cf. Gen. XXV 21-26 and Gen. XXXVIII), and the

presence of elements very like "S" within the fabric of J (Gen. XIX). It will also, if possible, have to account for the presence of complex narratives, as Gen. XVIII, within J without denying to this author, as Eissfeldt does, the credit for the beauty of the finished narrative. Such an hypothesis the present writer believes can be found in J's use of written sources. An attempt to develop this theory will be made in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV

SOURCES OF J

A study of the J document readily discloses that the traditions of which the author made use in the composition of his epic come ultimately from various localities. Three important sources of information for J are Israelitish, Canaanitish, and Egyptian legends. It is to be noted that Babylonian material is omitted from this list. Use of Babylonian mythology is abundantly evident in the Urgeschichte; but when this has been separated from the J document, as the last chapter attempted to demonstrate should be done, dependence of J on Babylonian legends cannot be discovered.

The aim of J to present the glorious origins and history of his people inevitably brought it about that Israelitish tribal tradition received the first place in his attention. Part of this material came from north Israel,[1] the more progressive section of the country, and the region which set the standard of the civilization in Palestine. The stories which were most popular there would naturally be known in Judah; and since they concerned a portion of the whole Israel, J would not neglect them in his account of Israel's origins. A large body of tribal

1. Cf. Chapter I.

Chapter IV

Sources of J

A study of the J document reveals literary and linguistic traditions of which the author made use in the composition of his epic from multiple item variant journeys. Three important sources of information for J are Israelite, Canaanite, and Babylonian Legend. It is to be noted that Babylonian material is omitted from this list. Use of Babylonian material is questionable without in some [illegible]; yet when this has been separated from the J document, as has been done, considerable attention to immediate [illegible] in Genesis, consideration of J as Babylonian legend [illegible] be discussed.

The aim of J in present has already been [illegible] history of his people Israelite. Already it seems that Israelite tribal traditions preceding the Exodus place in his memories. Just as this material came from many [illegible], the same progressive evolution of the country, in the region which had the structure of the Israelite [illegible]. The stories which were most popular were [illegible] or known in Canaan; and since they concerned a portion of the whole Israel, J found no material [illegible] account of Israel's origins. A large part of Genesis

1. Cf. Chapter 1.

tradition was likewise current in the south, and as a southerner J was greatly interested therein.[1] From his pen we find many stories of southern shrines and southern heroes which were omitted by the later author whose readers were partial to the north. Thus for the great mass of tribal tradition, which formed the most important part of his narrative, J went to all sections of Israel, north as well as south, with a readiness to incorporate in his epic all the appealing stories of the development of his nation.

Among the Canaanites part of J's material had its ultimate origin. In those stories whose main interest is the sacredness of particular sanctuaries in the land are found very ancient legends which grew up in the respective localities of which they speak. At the well of Beerlahairoi (Gen. XVI), at the oaks of Mamre near Hebron (Gen. XVIII), at Beersheba (Gen. XXVI), at Bethel (Gen. XXVIII), and at Penuel (Gen. XXXII) folk tales were current among the Canaanitish inhabitants to account for the sacredness of the spots. When the Hebrew tribes took possession of the land these shrines were adopted by them as places for their worship, along with the deities who were reverenced there. In many cases these deities were identified with Yahweh, and the stories told about them were applied to Yahweh. With such alterations and further adaptation to make them more suited to their own tradition they were adopted by the Israelitic people, and by the time of J appeared to be

1. Cf. Chapter I.

genuine stories of the founders of the nation.[1]

Knowledge about the land of Egypt J seems to have acquired from books and oral narratives with which he was familiar.[2] In most respects his information appears to have been accurate, although occasional errors betray the fact that he elaborated his sources to make them more vivid and interesting. The number 5 which is so frequent in Egyptian documents is used freely by J in the Joseph stories (Gen. XLI 34, XLV 22, XLVII 2, 24). The abhorrence of the Egyptians for dealing with the Hebrews is mentioned by him as something surprising to his people (Gen. XLIII 32). Gen. XLVII 13-26 gives an explanation of the curious economic condition of the land of Egypt; and while it is, as Peet demonstrates,[3] purely imaginative in its presentation of events, at the same time it shows a clear understanding of the burdens of taxation imposed upon the Egyptian people. A very striking example of Egyptian color is found, moreover, in J's story of Joseph and his master's wife (Gen. XXXIX), which bears a strong resemblance to an Egyptian story of the XIXth dynasty. In the Egyptian story one brother is a trusted sharer of the other's home, and a faithful furtherer of all his best interests. The evil desires of the wife of the elder brother, however, cause

1. Guthe, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, p. 183 ff.

2. Spiegelberg, Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jacob (Gen. 50, 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägypt. Quellen, in OLZ, 1923.

3. Peet, Egypt and the Old Testament, p. 96.

[illegible] stories of the founders of the nation.[1]

Knowledge about the land of Egypt I seems to have acquired from books and oral narratives with which he was familiar.[2] In most respects his information appears to have been accurate, although occasional errors betray the fact that he elaborated his sources to make them more vivid and interesting. The number 3 which is so frequent in Egyptian documents is used freely by J in his Joseph stories (Gen. XLI 34, XIV 20, XLVII 6, 24). The importance of the Egyptians for dealing with the Israelites is maintained by his assertion corresponding to six people (Gen. XLIII 32). Gen. XLVII 13-26 gives an explanation of the unique economic condition of the land of Egypt; and while it is, as Peet demonstrates, purely imaginative in its presentation of events, at the same time it shows a clear understanding of the motives of taxation imposed upon the Egyptian people.[3] A very striking example of Egyptian color is found, moreover, in J's story of Joseph and his master's wife (Gen. XXXIX). Julius Oppert a strong researcher in an Egyptian theory of the XXIX dynasty. In the Egyptian story one brother is a trusted counsel of the other's house, and a faithful fugitive of all his best interests. The evil desires of the wife of the elder brother, however, cause

1. Gunne, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, p. 123 ff.

2. Spiegelberg, Die Religion des Pentateuches Jesus (Gen. 30, 4 ff.) in Hinsicht der Ägypt. Religion, in Ztschr. [illegible]

3. Peet, Egypt and the Old Testament, p. 98.

her to entice the younger to betray the trust placed in him, and when she is unsuccessful, to accuse him falsely to her husband. As a result, the husband attempts to slay his younger brother, whom he believes to be unfaithful, and the latter is forced to flee. In the continuation of the Egyptian story there is little resemblance to the biblical narrative, but the sequence just described is very like J's story in Gen. XXXIX. That foreigners sometimes achieved an important place in Egyptian affairs, and reached positions comparable to that of Joseph in Egypt is shown by Erman-Ranke in Aegypten, p. 118 f. where he describes the known position of an officer of the reign of Amenophis III or IV and compares it with the Genesis narrative. "Wir glauben," says he, "es noch zu sehen, wie die Abgesandten der fremden Fürsten vor den Toren des Palastes warten, voll Spannung auf die Antwort des Königs, die ihr vornehmer Landsmann ihnen bringen wird, und es ist gewiss kein Zufall, dass uns dies Bild an die Gestalt Josephs erinnert, der zwischen dem Pharao und seinen eigenen Brüdern vermittelt. Der Erinnerung an die Schicksale und die Wirksamkeit solcher Männer wie Dûdu wird sie ihre Entstehung verdanken. Finden wir doch gerade bei diesem Dûdu noch eine merkwürdige Parallele zur Josephsgeschichte: Ein stattliches Gemälde auf der Hauptwand seines Grabes zeigt uns, wie der König in Gegenwart zahlreicher hoher Beamter den Dûdu zum ersten Diener des Königs in Achet-Aton ernennt und ihn mit goldenen Ketten schmücken lässt. Und wenn wir dann sehen, wie der so

hoch Geehrte und reich Geschmückte auf seinem von zwei feurigen Rossen gezogenen Wagen dahinsprengt und die Menge ihm jubelnd zuruft, so möchte man das Ganze für eine Darstellung der 'Erhöhung Josephs' ansehen, wie sie uns im 41. Kapitel der Genesis erzählt wird." Likewise while the forty days of mourning for Jacob (Gen. L 3) is in accordance with the Semitic preference for the number forty, not with Egyptian custom, the remainder of the account of the embalming of Jacob's body shows an exact acquaintance with the usage of the Egyptians. At certain points, however, J's presentation of Egyptian stories shows incomplete knowledge of conditions in the country. In Gen. XII camels are included among the possessions which Abram acquired during his sojourn in the land of Egypt; yet it has been pointed out[1] that the camel was not introduced as a beast of burden in Egypt until long after the time of the J writer. In the story of the Egyptian oppression the denial of straw to the Hebrew workmen is not a sign of J's close acquaintance with Egyptian traditions. On the contrary,[2] it is an indication that he knew how to use his imagination to make his pictures vivid, for the character of Egyptian mud is such that straw is by no means essential to the making of bricks. If straw had been denied to the Hebrew workmen their task would have been by

1. Erman-Ranke, Aegypten, p. 586.

2. Peet, Egypt and the Old Testament, p. 99 f.

Such dancers and rich handicrafts and sailors yet, and Egyptian boxes gymnasia have delighted and die Menge ihm idealist merit, so Odoitn was one Name "Ur ohne Bewegung der 'smoking Joseph' ansehen, wie sie uns in Al. Kapitel der Genesis erzählt wird." Likewise while the forty days of mourning for Jacob (Gen. L 3) is in accordance with the Semitic preference for the number forty, not with Egyptian custom, the remainder of the account of the embalming of Jacob's body shows an exact acquaintance with the usage of the Egyptians. At certain points, however, its presentation of Egyptian stories shows incomplete knowledge of conditions in the country. In Gen. XII camels are included among the possessions which Abram acquired during his sojourn in the land of Egypt; yet it has been pointed out[1] that the camel was not introduced as a beast of burden in Egypt until long after the time of the I writer. In the story of the Egyptian appreciation the denial of straw to the Hebrew workmen is not a sign of its close acquaintance with Egyptian traditions. On the contrary,[2] it is an indication that he knew how to use his imagination to make his pictures vivid. For the character of Egyptian mud is such that straw is by no means essential to the making of bricks. If straw had been denied to the Hebrew workmen their task would have been by

1. Kamm-Gaste, Aegypten, p. 68.

2. Peet, Egypt and the Old Testament, p. 49 f.

so much easier. A slight indication that J was acquainted with Egypt may be found in the description of the food of that country in Nu. XI 5; but this section is of little significance for the question, since only such information is found herein as would be expected from anybody who had been a casual tourist in the country or had read books concerning the nature of the land. Sometimes the east wind, which, according to J (Ex. XIV), turned back the sea to permit a crossing, is used as evidence of his incomplete knowledge of Egyptian geography, since the Red Sea would not be so affected by a wind from the east, but rather by a wind from the north or northwest. This is not, however, a clear case of J's ignorance of Egyptian geography, if Peet is right in departing from the majority of scholars in his description of the route which was in the mind of all the biblical writers.[1] The sea of the exodus was not the Red Sea, but a sea of reeds (ים סוף) which was located on the edge of the Mediterranean. It is thus precisely an east wind which would accomplish the desired result. It may be concluded, then, that J's knowledge of Egypt was largely second-hand, derived from books or oral traditions, or possibly occasional brief visits to the country. He can scarcely have known Egypt familiarly from his own experience, since the Egyptian coloring is

1. Peet, op. cit., pp. 134-145.

so much easier. A minor implication that I was acquainted with Egypt may be found in the description of the road of that country in 5a. If so, but this section is of little significance for the question, since only good information is found herein as could be expected from someone who was been a casual tourist in the country or who read books concerning the nature of the land. Nonetheless the most salient, according to 1 (pp. 177). Across back the sea to which a crocodile, is used as evidence of his innocence concerning of Egyptian geography, since the sea could not be in allusion of a wind from the east, but rather in a wind from the north or northwest. This is not, however, a clear sense of 7's ignorance of Egyptian geography, it just is right in separating from the majority of scholars in his identification of the route which was in the mind of all the biblical writers.[1] The sea of the crocodile was not the red sea, but a sea of reeds ( ) which was located on the edge of the Mediterranean. It is then precisely a sea which 5a's could accommodate the desired results. It can be concluded, then, that 7's knowledge of Egypt was largely second-hand, derived from books or oral traditions, or possibly conversations which took place in the country. He did certainly not have much first-hand experience, since the Egyptian scholars in

1. Ibid., op. cit., pp. 168-169.

too pale, too little lifelike.

It is widely recognized that J relied for part, at least, of his information on tradition circulating orally among the people of his day. Some of the tales were told and retold at the sanctuaries to which the people came for sacrifice and feasting. Others were related by minstrels wandering over the land. In the course of time many diverse elements were incorporated in the stories, which became so familiar by constant repetition that their incongruity was little appreciated.

The extent to which J relied on written sources is a question on which little certainty has been reached. Procksch[1] says flatly that we are not in a position to answer it. Holzinger[2], while admitting that some fixation of the stories in literary form must have preceded J, since his work is historical prose which must have rested on a collection of poetic traditions, considers that the existing traces of such sources are not sufficient to assist in their reconstruction, and the matter must be left as insolvable.

If laws were to be found in J, possibly they would offer the most favorable position for a beginning of a search for written sources. The so-called J decalogue in Ex. XXXIV, however, is the only group of laws in the Pentateuch in which scholars have been able to discover traces of J; and

1. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 307.

2. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 138.

this legal material the present investigation has concluded, in agreement with the article of Professor Robert H. Pfeiffer on The Oldest Decalogue, does not belong in the J document.

In poems which J included in his work evidence of some written sources may possibly be found. The long poems in the Pentateuch, however, which previously have been considered a part of J, the present study has found great difficulty in retaining in that document. The Blessing of Jacob in Gen. XLIX originates from a time at least as early as J, yet it is doubtful whether J incorporated it in his epic. The Yahwist is very skilful in unifying his narrative and in arranging suitable settings for all parts; but chapter XLIX intrudes in its present location, and the introductory phrase which attempts to obviate this difficulty is not in the style of J, It is post-exilic writers who refer to the last days-- באחרית הימים --whereas J looks forward to a long and expanding sphere of usefulness for his nation. Thus Gen. XLIX is probably a poem which has been inserted within the continuous J narrative, rather than a poem which was known and used by J. That references to early stories which we know elsewhere in Gen. XXXIV and XXXV are found in chapter XLIX offers no objection to this decision, for reasons have previously been given[1] for rejecting these sections from the J document. The Song of the Well in Nu. XXI is occasionally attributed by critics to J. A discussion of the correctness

1. Cf. Chapter III.

of that decision is given in Part I. The present writer is of the opinion that it does not constitute a part of J. Likewise with the Blessing of Balaam in Nu. XXIV, if the whole story of Balaam and Balak of Moab is rejected from J, in accordance with the discussion of Part I, the poem, although early, cannot be thought to have formed a part of the J document.

Brief poetical fragments are, however, found in J which evidently circulated among the people long before J incorporated them in his work. The first of these is Gen. XVI 11aβb, 12. Here is a short section which seems to consist of six lines of 2,2 meter.

הִנֵּךְ הָרָה וְיָלַדְתְּ בֵּן
וְקָרָאתְ שְׁמוֹ יִשְׁמָעֵאל
כִּי-שָׁמַע יְהוָה אֶל-עָנְיֶךָ
וְהוּא יִהְיֶה פֶּרֶא אָדָם
יָדוֹ בַכֹּל וְיַד כֹּל בּוֹ
וְעַל-פְּנֵי כָל-אֶחָיו יִשְׁכֹּן

In Gen. XXI 6b, 7 is another rhythmical section which, when it is rearranged according to the ingenious suggestion of Budde,[1] forms a couplet of 4,4 meter.

כִּי צָחֹק עָשָׂה לִי אֱלֹהִים הֵינִיקָה בָנִים שָׂרָה
כִּי-יָלַדְתִּי בֵן לִזְקֻנָיו כָּל-הַשֹּׁמֵעַ יִצְחַק-לִי

It is not certain, however, that this fragment constitutes a part of J, for, as has already been commented in Part I, the

1. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, p. 224.

of that description is given in Part I. The present writer is of the opinion that it does not constitute a part of 3. Therefore with the blending of Salem in Gen. XXIV, if the whole story of Salem and Salem of Melch is related from 3, in accordance with the division of Part I, the place, although early, cannot be thought to have formed a unit of the J document.

Prior, medical frequents are, however, found in 1 which evidently circulated among the people long before J incorporated them in his work. The chief of these is Gen. XXI 14-19, 32. Here is a short section which seems to consist of six lines of 3.7 meter.

[illegible]

In Gen. XXI 33, V is another theological section which, then it is rearranged according to the inconsistent suggestion of Budde, forms a couplet of 4.4 meter.

[illegible]

It is not certain, however, that this frequent constitutes a part of 4. For, as has already been commented in Item I, the

1. Budde, Die Bücher Ueberlieferung, p. 220.

etymology of the name Isaac has been referred to previously in Gen. XVIII 13 ff. Would J have made the same pun on the name twice with so brief an interval between the sections? In Gen. XXV 23* occurs another couplet of 4,4 rhythm.

שׁנֵי גוֹיִם בְּבִטְנֵךְ וּשְׁנֵי לְאֻמִּים מִמֵּעַיִךְ יִפְרֵדוּ
וּלְאֹם מִלְּאֹם יֶאֱמָץ. וְרַב יַעֲבֹד צָעִיר

This, like the somewhat longer section in chapter XVI, is undoubtedly a part of the J source. Another poetical fragment which is clearly a part of J is found in the latter half of verse 27, Gen. XXVII. This is briefer still than any of the others, for it seems to consist of but one line of 4,4 accents.

לֵית בְּנֵי בְרִית שָׂדֶה אֲשֶׁר בֵּרְכוֹ יְהוָה

The poetical fragments which have been presented here may have been taken by J from written sources. It must be admitted, however, that the brevity of these sections is such that they could as easily have been transmitted orally over a period of many years. In neither the poems nor the laws, therefore, is to be found proof that J made use of written sources.

Other means, however, exist for distinguishing within J, material which is evidently derived from written sources. Two important bases upon which to begin such an investigation are the following: 1) within the narratives of J are found elements which are foreign to J's own beliefs and mental tendencies; 2) compound narratives have been

included in J's epic, although J's literary ability, as seen in the greater part of his work, is such that he would have skilfully smoothed out all inharmonious elements if he had had material with which to work as fluid as oral tradition.

The following sections offer the clearest indication that J was dependent upon written sources: Gen. XVIII, XIX, XXV 21-26, XXXII 4-9, 14a, the J material of Gen. XXXII 25-33, Ex. IV 24-26.

In Gen. XVIII two narratives seem to have been combined, one of which concerns Abraham and three men at the oaks of Mamre, and the other Abraham and Yahweh. An examination of the following sections will assist in making this condition more evident:

1a. וַיֵּרָא אֵלָיו יְהוָה בְּאֵלֹנֵי מַמְרֵא

2. וַיִּשָּׂא עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֹשָׁה אֲנָשִׁים נִצָּבִים עָלָיו וַיַּרְא
וַיָּרָץ לִקְרָאתָם מִפֶּתַח הָאֹהֶל וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אַרְצָה

3. וַיֹּאמַר אֲדֹנָי אִם-נָא מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אַל-נָא תַעֲבֹר מֵעַל
עַבְדֶּךָ

4. יֻקַּח-נָא מְעַט-מַיִם וְרַחֲצוּ רַגְלֵיכֶם וְהִשָּׁעֲנוּ תַּחַת הָעֵץ

5. וְאֶקְחָה פַת-לֶחֶם וְסַעֲדוּ לִבְּכֶם אַחַר תַּעֲבֹרוּ כִּי-עַל-כֵּן עֲבַרְתֶּם
עַל-עַבְדְּכֶם וַיֹּאמְרוּ כֵּן תַּעֲשֶׂה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ

.....

8. וַיִּקַּח הָמְאָה וְחֵלֶב וּבֶן-הַבָּקָר אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה וַיִּתֵּן לִפְנֵיהֶם וְהוּא-
עֹמֵד עֲלֵיהֶם תַּחַת הָעֵץ וַיֹּאכֵלוּ

9. ויאמרו אליו איה שרה אשתך ויאמר הנה באהל

10. ויאמר שוב אשוב אליך .....

13. ויאמר יהוה אל-אברהם למה זה צחקה שרה לאמר האף אמנם אלד ואני זקנתי

14. היפלא מיהוה דבר למועד אשוב אליך כעת חיה ולשרה בן

15. ותכחש שרה לאמר לא צחקתי כי יראה ויאמר לא כי צחקתי

16. ויקמו משם האנשים וישקפו על-פני סדם ואברהם הלך עמם לשלחם

20. ויאמר יהוה זעקת סדם ועמרה כי-רבה וחטאתם כי כבדה מאד

21. ארדה-נא וארא הכצעקתה הבאה אלי עשו כלה ואם-לא אדעה

22a. ויפנו משם האנשים ויבאו סדמה

The alternation of the singular and plural verbs and pronouns in these verses, and the coincident variation in the person of the guests -- now three men, and now Yahweh -- produces great confusion. The confusion has not resulted, however, from an attempted substitution of angels for Yahweh because it was felt that the deity played too anthropomorphic a part, although at a later time such revisions were frequent. At the basis of the chapter is a clearly polytheistic story of Abraham and three supernatural

visitors, very like the Greek myth of Baucis and Philemon. This early tale by the time of J had been modified for Israelitic use by the substitution of men for the three gods, and by the addition of the Israelitic legend of Yahweh's promise of the birth of Isaac. This narrative, imperfectly written, J took over for incorporation in his epic. How many changes J made in his source we are not in a position to tell. Our observation of J's ability to unify and vitalize his material would lead us to suppose that he may have been responsible for many of the details which make the chapter so charming, and for the omission of other features which are apt to spoil primitive popular folk-lore. The broad outlines of the legend as it lay before him, however, he preserved with the seams as his predecessors had left them.

Similarly in Gen. XIX a confused narrative is found wherein a story of Lot and two angels has been combined with an account of a conversation between Lot and Yahweh.[1] Not only, however, have two narratives been combined at this point, but the following characteristics, unusual in J, are likewise found in the chapter: the land of Canaan is shown to have been populated in the time of the patriarchs by people whose relations with the Hebrew fathers are extremely unfriendly; and the deity also is hostile to man. These characteristics contrast sharply with J's usual beliefs,

1. Cf. the verbs and pronouns and the person of Lot's visitors in vv. 1-18 with those of vv. 19,21,22,24, 25,27.

but at the same time they resemble features prominent in the material which Pfeiffer calls S.[1] In this chapter vv. 30-38 bear a particular resemblance to Gen. IX 20-27. Since, in the preceding chapters of the J document, preparation has been made for the punishment of Lot, it seems natural to suppose that vv. 1-28 are a part of J. They were taken over by him, however, from written sources, to form the climax of this cycle of narratives; and his story ended with vv. 27 and 28, which actually form a fitting conclusion. To this much later P's summary was added (v. 29). In the source from which J had derived the story of Sodom and Gomorrah, however, vv. 30-38 terminated the narrative. These were so displeasing to J's sensibilities that he discarded them; only an editor after the time of P secured their preservation by appending them to the already completed narrative.

The resemblance of Gen. XXV 21-26 to Gen. XXXVIII 27-30 has been noted in the preceding chapter. Such close parallelism of phrases and clauses must rest on literary relationship of the two sections. It seems probable that J had before him written source material which included both the story of the birth of Jacob and Esau and that of the twins Pharez and Zarah. He utilized the former story much as he found it, discarding its parallel narrative as unsuitable for his epic.

In Gen. XXXII 4-9, 14a a narrative of fewer

1. Cf. Chapter III.

difficulties is found. The primary function of this section is to account for the etymology of Mahanaim, but it also serves the purpose of describing Jacob's preparations for meeting Esau. According to chapter XXXIII, however, an entirely different arrangement is adopted when the critical moment of Esau's approach arrives. The story of this chapter is told by J as though chapter XXXII did not form any part of the epic. When it is remembered that J is usually particularly skilful in the task of unifying his epic, one wonders whether this unevenness in his narrative is likewise a result of the use of written sources.

Similarly the story of the change of Jacob's name to Israel, which is found in the latter part of the same chapter, is essential to the J narrative; yet at its base is a polytheistic legend in which the divinity was openly unfriendly to the patriarch. Polytheism and unsympathetic relations between Yahweh and Israel are both matters against which J's scruples are aroused. If written sources had not been before him, would he not have modified the story further until it more nearly conformed to his standards?

In the account of the origin of infant circumcision (Ex. IV 24-26) Yahweh is shown to be hostile to Moses, and emphasis is laid on a cultic act. While, however, these elements are foreign to the work of J, the section is so picturesque and obviously ancient that it is probable that J was attracted by it and included it in his document. In

view of the chapters previously discussed, does it not seem likely that he adopted it from a written source?

In these sections of Yahwistic material the following resemblances have been noted to the material which Professor Pfeiffer calls S:[1] the stories are not completely unified, but composite elements which have not been reconciled with one another stand here side by side; the belief in polytheism, which forms the background of the narratives, has never been successfully concealed by the insertion of the name Yahweh; the patriarchs no longer wander through an empty land, but they live among people who are often hostile to them; and the deity who acts in the course of these stories is not primarily interested in the welfare of man, he is often arbitrarily unfriendly.

A further examination of these stories and "S" reveals very interesting facts about their background. Polytheism, as has been said, is found herein; likewise is the custom of sacred prostitution (Gen. XXXVIII). Sacrifice also is freely practised (Gen. IV, VIII 20 f.), although J, openly prejudiced against it, excludes it from his work (Gen. XII 7,8, XIII 18, XXVI 25). It is just these features that characterized the worship of the shrines in the time of J and into the period of the reform prophets. Human sacrifice as well as animal

1. Cf. Chapter III.

1.

and vegetable offerings, archaeology proves was prevalent at the sanctuaries. Against this E makes a vigorous attack by telling the moving story of Abraham's discovery that God did not wish man's sons to be offered him (Gen. XXII). J, disgusted by this element of the institution of sacrifice, subtly excludes all cultic acts from his picture of the true worship of Yahweh. So at a later time the reform prophets sought to purify the religion which had even then failed to shake off this barbarous practice. Likewise sacred prostitution and the worship of the baalim Hosea and his successors singled out as characteristic of the influence of the popular shrines (Hosea II et passim). From a background in which these corrupt practices had their setting, however, J's source material and "S" seem to have had their origin.

As a result of the aforementioned observations some conclusions may be drawn concerning J's written sources. Probably under the sponsorship of the priesthood, which J ignores as he ignores the whole cult, legends grew up and circulated at the shrines. These tales seem to have been written down in a somewhat connected form, for Gen. XXV 21-26 and XXXVIII 27-30 evidently issue from the same hand. The work was poorly done, however, and incongruous elements which were the result of repetition on many lips were not

1. Cook, The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology, p. 79, 82 ff.

eliminated by the editor. Similarly, modern fairy tales often vary with different story-tellers and audiences. Red Riding Hood has a tragic or happy ending, according to the tastes of the children to whom it is being told. So the variations of different individuals were preserved side by side in this collection of Hebrew tales. Because the work was poorly done, however, the collection was very nearly lost to us. The cream of its contents was utilized by J and transformed to exert a beneficial influence on the people. Naturally, therefore, the inferior original was largely neglected by later individuals (compare E's close parallelism to J) and almost disappeared. It seems to have originated in the south[1], however, which was the most conservative part of the country and the home of J himself; because its circulation was in this remote mountainous region the original collection did not sink into entire disuse with the publication of J. Revisions and additions continued to be made (cf. the late material in the story of Cain and Abel and Gen. XXXIV). Finally, however, when P was added to the Hexateuch, or probably somewhat later than this, an undescriminating editor was moved by the desire to preserve all available ancient material, and inserted much of what J had dis-

1. That most of the traditions center their interest in that region is adduced by Professor Pfeiffer (A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis, in ZAW, 1930, p. 72) in support of his theory that they were written down in the neighboring region of Edom. It seems more probable, however, from its Israelitish interests that this collection of legends had its origin in the Judean highlands, and there continued in circulation.

carded within the pages of the Israelitic law-book.

The use which J made of his sources is a subject on which no conclusion is easily reached. Two extreme views are expressed by the scholars Luther and Gunkel. The former takes the point of view that J was not at all bound by his material, but that he rewrote all that he received, transforming it to conform to his own beliefs and prejudices. Thus he says:[1] "Der Jahwist, d.h. J[1], ist nicht eine Etappe in dem natürlichen Prozess der Umgestaltung; er will nicht nur die alten Erzählungen weiter geben, sondern er schreibt sein Werk, weil er bestimmte Ansichten darin ausdrücken will, Gedanken, die den herrschenden Strömungen seiner Zeit vielfach widerstreben." Gunkel, on the other hand, considers that the personalities of the writers of both J and E did not influence their presentation of the traditions they received. Their great attempt was to reproduce faithfully the legends before them. The most flagrant crudities of the originals were removed, and some narratives were combined; but in all their work the lines of the originals were preserved with remarkable fidelity. This opinion is expressed, among other places, in Genesis, p. LVIII: "Diese Sammler sind also nicht Herren, sondern Diener ihrer Stoffe. Wir dürfen sie uns denken, erfüllt von Pietät gegen die schönen alten Erzählungen und bestrebt, sie so treulich und gut widerzugeben, wie sie nur vermochten. Treue ist ihre

1. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 108.

erste Eigenschaft gewesen; darum haben sie so vieles übernommen, was sie nur halb verstanden, und was ihrem eigenen Empfinden fern stand; und sie haben oft Besonderheiten einzelner Erzählungen treu bewahrt."

It is always difficult to persuade a genius to fit into a set mold, and it is particularly difficult to determine any pattern which describes J's procedure under all circumstances. J seems to have reproduced the main features of the ancient traditions so faithfully that we can catch a vivid picture of the olden time. Yet his sensibilities were finely adjusted and his first aim was to present the origins and history of his people in form worthy of so significant a nation. Certain prejudices, therefore, influenced him to alter his sources. The legends likewise required adaptation to make them suited to a unified epic. It was consequently an ever varying procedure that J followed. Now he was content to reproduce tradition that seemed to him comparatively harmless, and now he remodeled it to present ideals of his own. The effect produced by this variety of methods was far finer than consistency in any one system would have brought.

Among the prejudices that influenced J is his religious idealism. To him Yahweh was the sole god for an Israelite to worship. He was responsible for the birth and continuance of the nation. He was the god who had appeared to the patriarchs at their entrance into the land, showing the

erste Bismarck's gewesen; denn bevor sie so vielen Bösewichtern, was sie nur halb verstanden, und was ihrem eigenen Temperament fern stand; und sie haben oft Bösewichten allzuoften zerschlagen hier gewesen.'

It is always difficult to persuade a genius to fit into a set role, and it is particularly difficult to determine any pattern which describes Ibsen's productive under all circumstances. I seems to have reproduced his main features of the ancient traditions so faithfully that we can catch a vivid picture of the olden time. Yet his remarkability were firmly attested and his first aim was to present the origins and history of his people in form worthy of so significant a nation. Nevertheless, therefore, influenced him to cling his customs. The legends likewise required adaptation to make them suited to a unified epic. It was consequently an ever varying procedure that I followed. Now he was content to reproduce tradition that seemed to his contemporaries heretical, and now he remodeled it to present ideals of his own. The effect produced by this variety of methods was far finer than consistency in any one system would have created.

Among the peculiarities that influenced I is his religious idealism. To him Yahweh was the sole god for an Israelite to worship. He was responsible for the birth and continuance of the nation. He was the god who had appeared to his patriarchs at their entrance into the land, showing the

places which were sacred to him (Gen. XII 7,8, XIII 14-18, XXI 33). So far as J was concerned, the sanctuary tales related the intercourse between the patriarchs and this one god. The baalim, to whom they originally referred, are excluded entirely from consideration. As a result of this point of view, whenever in his sources the deity is not already in some measure identified with Yahweh, J makes this addition himself. So both אל ראי (Gen. XVI 13) and אל עולם (Gen. XXI 33) are expressly identified by J with Yahweh.[1] As has been mentioned before, the popular cult contained so many degrading influences (cf. the human sacrifice and sacred prostitution, of the presence of which in Canaan abundant evidence exists) that J, unwilling to be didactic, simply eliminated all traces of it from the narratives.[2] The only exceptions to this statement are his admission that altars were erected (but even here he converts them into places of prayer), and the story of the origin of circumcision (Ex. IV 24-26). The latter seems to be a case where, as in other examples mentioned above, J did less to modify his source than he would have done, had it not been written.

Another prejudice which influenced J in his modification of the source material was his hatred of the

1. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 113.
2. Cf. Chapter VI.

places which were sacred to him (Ex. XXI 7,8, XXII 14-19, XXIII 33). So far as I was concerned, the religious tales related the improprieties between the patriarchs and their god. The Israelis, to whom they originally referred, are excluded entirely from consideration. As a result of this point of view, whenever in his sources the deity is not already in some manner identified with Yahweh, I make this addition himself. So both Ex. 4 (Gen. XVI 13) and 18:4 (Gen. XXI 33) are expressly identified by J with Yahweh.[1] As has been mentioned before, the popular cult contained so many degrading influences (cf. the human sacrifice and sacred prostitution, of the presence of which in Canaan abundant evidence exists) that J, unwilling to be diabolic, simply eliminated all traces of it from the narratives.[2] The only exceptions to this statement are his admission that altars were erected (but even here he converts them into places of prayer), and the story of the origin of circumcision (Ex. IV 24-26). The latter seems to be a case where, as in other examples mentioned above, J did less to modify his source than he could have done, and it has been written.

Another prejudice which influenced J in his modification of the source material was his hatred of the

1. Baumer. In Bayer. Die Israeliten, p. 115.
2. Cf. Chapter VI.

agricultural life which Israel had adopted from the Canaanites along with their religion. As at a later time the Rechabites attributed the corruptions of civilization to the influences of the Canaanites with their worship of all that produced fertility, so J shunned references to agriculture in connection with the patriarchs. The Hebrew fathers had nothing to do with so degrading a profession. Instead they are pictured continually as nomads, caring for their flocks as they wandered through the land. Contrary to Luther,[1] who believes that J was consistent in removing all traces of agricultural life from the tradition, the present writer believes that in a few cases (Gen. XVIII 6, XXV 34, XXVII 25, XXX 14) evidence of the nature of the stories as they circulated among the people has been retained in spite of references to the products of the soil of the land of Canaan. Probably J was unaware, however, that he had not entirely eliminated features inharmonious with a nomadic life; and indeed such references are so inconspicuous that J had no need to fear that they would suggest to the readers similarity between the patriarchs' lives and those of their neighbors the Canaanites.

J is moved by a fine aesthetic feeling when he omits coarseness and brutality from his epic. The vulgar stories of Shechem and Dinah (Gen. XXXIV), Judah and Tamar (Gen. XXXVIII), Reuben's incest (Gen. XXXV 21,22), and some of

1. Luther, op. cit., p. 129 f.

the Urgeschichte are omitted outright from the content of his narrative. Part of the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (vv. 30-38) is likewise discarded by J, although his narrative cycle demanded the inclusion of the main features of the story, and the least objectionable section was utilized by him. It is also as a result of his aesthetic interest that J pictures his heroes as desiring peace. Abram grants Lot his choice of the different portions of the land in order to avoid trouble between them (Gen. XIII). Jacob skilfully outwits Esau when he has an opportunity, but he flees from him rather than participate in any conflict (Gen. XXVII); and when he comes to dwell with Laban no violence arises as a result of the jealousy between them. Jacob deliberately sets about outwitting him, and in the end gains great prosperity. War and strife therefore are not means by which J's heroes gain their ends; but that they are not is a result of J's design. A comparison of his epic with Gen. IV and XXXIV, and also with the Iliad, whose whole theme is war, shows that martial exploits form the central theme in similar tales recounted by most early authors.

J's pride in his people and his desire for an illustrious origin probably was responsible for his statement that the patriarchs came from Haran, the home of the powerful Arameans (Gen. XXIV, XXIX). At this point his too great enthusiasm was recognized by E, who corrected him

in accordance with facts which any northerner would have known.[1]

According to Luther radical changes were made by J at other points of his epic.[2] In the Jacob cycle, in particular, an abrupt departure was made from the stories which he found in his sources. In the popular tradition three different stages in the development of the personality of Jacob could be distinguished. In some stories he was a god whose special sanctuary was Bethel. In others he was a hero, who, like the Greek Odysseus, performed feats of gigantic strength; so he alone rolled a massive stone away from the well (Gen. XXIX). In still others he was a simple peasant, striving for supremacy over his brother Esau. J minimized, Luther thinks, the first two of these characteristics and emphasized the last, at the same time identifying the popular figure with the eponymus ancestor of his nation Israel. The most important incident in the cycle is that of the change of name at the sanctuary of Penuel (Gen. XXXII 25-33). J here converted Jacob's supernatural opponent into a mere human being; he added to the myth the account of the change of Jacob's name; and he removed the scene from Bethel, to which Luther thinks it originally referred (cf. P in Gen. XXXV), to Penuel in order

1. Cf. Chapter II.

2. Luther, op. cit., p. 109 ff.

in modernism this force will be any [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

to reduce still more the danger of considering Jacob the god of Bethel. One cannot think, however, that J was responsible for so many changes in this story. If J had desired to alter to so great an extent the narrative which was before him, he would have been capable of producing a finished product less grossly anthropomorphic than this Genesis story. The polytheism is so thinly veiled in the present narrative that it is evident that J has not tampered much with tradition as he found it. Furthermore, the identification of Israel with Jacob must have taken place before J's work. In the sources which J used the two were known to be identical. Gen. XXXV 21 f. already referred to Jacob as Israel. It thus seems that Luther goes to an extreme at this point in searching for places in which J has altered tradition. Most of the development of the figure Jacob probably had taken place before J received the traditions which he used in his epic.

Likewise it is questionable whether, as Luther thinks, great changes have been made by J in the tradition about Moses.[1] Did the tradition he received agree with the narrative of E that Moses led the people from Egypt by the performance of many miracles? If so J has decreased Moses's importance and suppressed the miracles in order to enhance the glory of Yahweh. Moses has become a mere tool of the deity, who himself

1. Luther, op. cit., p. 116 ff.

procures the Israelites' deliverance. While at first such a view as is here presented seems attractive, since it is well known that the miraculous appears in the earliest and most primitive reports, and the view of J seems to be so rational as to be hardly a true picture of spontaneous popular tradition, it is not an opinion which can be accepted with conviction. A natural progress in the conception of Moses's importance seems to be visible from the early writers through post-exilic times. In J Moses is a humble instrument of Yahweh; in E a priest and wonder-worker; in D a prophet; and in P, at the end of the development, he becomes a semi-divine representative of God. Since the honor of a prophet, as a rule, is proportionate to the distance from his own age, it is difficult to suppose that J's view is actually younger than E's. Luther likewise is convinced that J has changed the tradition which he received concerning Moses's parents. The remnants of J's discussion of the matter Luther[1] finds in Ex. II. 1b, while he supposes that 1a has been altered by an editor who wished to correct J's statement that Moses's father was son of Ephraim. Moses, then, according to Luther's reconstruction of J, had the son of Ephraim as father, and the daughter of Levi as mother. Such a conclusion he believes demanded as a result of the importance assigned to Ephraim in the Joseph narratives. In transforming the

1. Luther, op. cit., p. 118 ff.

tradition, which elsewhere unanimously considers Moses a true Levite, Luther believes J acted in the desire to support his view that the worship of Yahweh was an immemorial custom among genuine Israelites. The tradition which he knew, and on which E and P relied maintained that the Levites introduced an innovation with the Yahweh worship. It must be admitted, however, that the source to which Ex. II 1 belongs is very difficult to determine. E is the document which elaborates with tender emotion the childhood of Moses. It would be expected, then, that at least part of v. 1 would belong to that source. Whether a part is also from J there seems to be no way of determining. In view of the fact, however, that the later editors of the Pentateuch were interested in proving an early and illustrious origin for the Levitical priesthood it seems probable that they have been largely responsible for Ex. II 1, thereby tracing their lineage back to Moses. It is a dangerous procedure, therefore, to speculate on the nature of Moses's parentage according to J, since in all probability this portion of his work has been entirely lost to us.

In developing his theory that J alters tradition to suit his own views, Luther also points out that J deliberately enhances Yahweh's prestige when he says that his worship dates from time immemorial.[1] In chapter II this point has already been discussed, and it has been noted that Luther's

1. Luther, op. cit., p. 121 f.

explanation of the curious difference between J and the later writers E and P is not the only one possible. As Moore, Haller, and Barton have said, J may, at this point, be dependent on tradition of the southern tribes not shared by those of E's home in the north.

Traditional features in the tales which J saw fit to preserve in spite of their incomplete correspondence with his own ideas are found in places in his epic.[1] At times the primitive polytheism is not thoroughly concealed, although too flagrant departures from henotheism are not permitted. Altars are constructed by the patriarchs in spite of the fact that their only use could be in the offering of sacrifice.[2] Apparently they were so essential an equipment of any shrine that J found it impossible to conceive of the existence of a sanctuary dedicated to Yahweh without them. The conquest of the land is shown by J to have been a gradual process in which Canaanites and Israelites became amalgamted (Judges I), although later Israelites who desired to increase the prestige of their people described it as a short and spectacularly successful enterprise. Compound narratives, the result of a combination of two or more earlier stories, J has preserved in spite of their inharmonious features.

In not all of the examples given in the last paragraph

1. Cf. the discussion of Gen. XVIII, XIX, and XXXII above.
2. Cf. Chapter VI.

was J constrained to reproduce the tradition because it came from written sources before him. Abram's erection of altars is reported in Gen. XII 7, 8, and XIII 18, for which there is no reason to suppose a basis in written tradition. Yet in most cases oral tradition was so variable that J felt free to modify it where a written tale he would have preserved with the least possible alteration. Such seems to have been the principle by which J worked, although to the written sources he probably added piquant details which increased their artistic valuation.

It has been noted in the preceding chapter that a similar vocabulary has been used by both J and the author of the early stories of the Urgeschichte. It is on this basis that the majority of previous writers have attributed both strands of material to the same author. If the hypothesis which has been presented in this chapter is correct, however, this resemblance of vocabulary is easily accounted for. J's home was in the region where his source material originated, and expressions frequently reappear on the lips of people who are neighbors. Furthermore, J incorporated in his epic some of the stories in his source with such fidelity that their incongruities remain. Naturally under such circumstances the vocabulary of the material before him was used by him in his own epic.

The question of the historicity of J in the Hexateuch is little affected by the discovery that he probably relied for part of his material on written sources. Oral tradition

is notoriously unreliable in preserving events of history with accurate details. Men of the present day know little of the times of their great-grandfathers, except where written records have been preserved. Where J relied on oral tradition, then, his sources were by no means reliable, although even so they were better than those of a later time after more errors had had an opportunity to develop. We have seen, also, that he did not feel bound to reproduce his oral sources with entire fidelity. The written sources, however, on which J drew, likewise were dependent on oral tradition. Although the date at which they were written is not determined, it cannot have been many years previous to J. The tales were already Israelitic, and the sanctuaries were considered Israelitic. The entrance into the land, therefore, is many years in the past, and the early stories are by no means contemporary documents. They rather represent an interesting stage just previous to J, when the popular tales began to crystallize. And they, like the epic of J, are to be considered legendary, and must be utilized with great caution in a search for early history.

CHAPTER V

LANGUAGE AND STYLE

a. Vocabulary

The J document is often distinguished from the other sources of the Hexateuch by the choice of words which either J alone of the writers of the Hexateuch employs or which he uses more often than any of the others. A list of those expressions which are characteristic of J is given below. It has been divided into two groups: (1) expressions which the present analysis has shown to be characteristic of J; and (2) some of the most important expressions which are often attributed to J but which the present analysis has found to be erroneously so considered.

(1) Phrases characteristic of J

The most important distinguishing mark of the J document is its use of the divine name יהוה throughout the narrative. This proper name distinguishes J from E particularly in the Book of Genesis and Exodus I and II. After the revelation to Moses at Horeb in E (Ex. III) that document also uses יהוה frequently, yet even in the rest of the E document the writer often employs אלהים. On the other hand, except where an Israelite is conversing with a foreigner (Gen. XXXIX 9, XLIII 23,29, XLIV 16)

CHAPTER V

LANGUAGE AND STYLE

a. Vocabulary

The J document is often distinguished from the other sources of the Hexateuch by the choice of words which either J alone or the writers of the Hexateuch employs or which he uses more often than any of the others. A list of those expressions which are characteristic of J is given below. It has been divided into two groups: (1) expressions which the present analysis has shown to be characteristic of J; and (2) some of the most important expressions which are often attributed to J but which the present analysis has found to be erroneously so considered.

(1) Phrases characteristic of J

The most important distinguishing mark of the J document is its use of the divine name יהוה throughout the narrative. This proper name distinguishes J from E particularly in the Book of Genesis and Exodus I and II. After the revelation to Moses at Horeb in E (Ex. III) that document also uses יהוה frequently, yet even in the part of the E document the writer often employs אלהים. On the other hand, except where an Israelite is conversing with a foreigner (Gen. XXXIX 9, XLIII 32,29, XLIV 16)

אלהים is never used by J as a proper name, the equivalent of יהוה.[1] J also is distinct from P in this respect; for the latter document employs the word אלהים from the story of the creation to the revelation of God to Abraham as אל שדי in Gen. XVII 1; then in the following chapters the expression אל שדי is used as far as chapter VI of Exodus, where the deity reveals himself to Moses as יהוה, emphasizing the fact that he is the same who was worshipped formerly by the patriarchs as אל שדי.

Likewise J is distinguished from E in his preference for the name Israel for the patriarch Jacob after Gen. XXXII 29, whereas E retains the original name of the patriarch throughout the course of his narrative.

It is J also who uses the name Sinai for the mountain at which the revelation to Moses occurred and to which the Israelites journeyed following their exodus from Egypt, while E, in the corresponding places, employs the name Horeb.

In J also is found the word Canaanites as the name for the original inhabitants of the land, in contrast to E's Amorites. The references to the Perizzites in connection with the Canaanites, which at times are found in passages which many critics consider J (cf. Kuenen, The Hexateuch, p. 256, for example), are in all probability the result of

1. Cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. lx, and Gunkel, Genesis, p. 243 f.

redactional work.[1]

The remaining expressions which are characteristic of J will be listed in alphabetical sequence:

אדני (as a periphrasis for <u>you</u>) -- 11: J (Gen. XXXIII 8,13, 14,15, XLIV 7,18,19,20,22,24, Jos. V 14)

4: probably J (Gen. XLVII 18 (3 occurrences),25)

1: E (Gen. XXXI 35)

1: JE (Nu. XXXII 25)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 9)

2: P (Nu. XXXVI 2 (2 occurrences))

4: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 27,31, Ex. XXXII 22, Nu. XIV 17)

אם .... אם -- 7: J (Gen. XXIV 25,44, XLIII 8, XLIV 16, XLVI 34, XLVII 3, L 9)

4: probably J (Gen. XLVII 19, Ex. V 14, XII 31,32)

3: E (Gen. XXXII 20, Ex. XVIII 18, Nu. XXIII 25)

1: possibly E (Gen. XXI 26)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 3)

1: P (Nu. XVIII 13)

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 25)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IV 10)

1. Holzinger, <u>Hexateuch</u>, p. 94.

relational mode.

The condition expressions which are other than arrays must be filled in in alphabetical sequence.

For (ex a certain-ness (or not)) -- Is: f (Non. XXXII: 4,16, 1,2, 2, 2014 9,1-,18, 0,1,1,1, 7ex. Y 34)

1: measurely f (Non. XVII 1) (a conversion)(.m)

1: m (Ion. Ian 2.4)

1: 39 (Ion. XXVI 34)

1: lexicomonic (Ion. XXXIV 1)

1: P (Ion. Nonc - (a conversion))

1: selected of commonly vision (Ion. XVII 7,27, Ion. 1,1,1 1, 7. Ion. XIV 1)

D4.... D7 -- 7. f (Ion. XXV 2, 11, XXIII 1, 2,19 12, 4,4, 2, 2 1)

1: measure f (Ion. XVII 16, Ion. Y 22, XXI 23,30)

1: m (Ion. XXXI 2, Ion. XVII 18, Ion. XXIII 40)

1: possible f Ion. XV 40)

1: monotonic (Ion. XXII 1)

1: P (Ion. XVIII 14)

1: Ang of Ionia 10. XVIII 40)

1: selected in conversion-origin (Ion. 1: 27)

1. Antecedent. Consequent. 2. 40.

נשׁ -- 12: J (Gen. XLV 10, XLVI 28 (2 occurrences),29,34, XLVII 1,4,6,27, L 8, Ex. VIII 18, IX 26)

י"ה כ" -- 3: J (Gen. XXVI 8, XLIII 21, XLIV 24)

2: the late editor of J at the end of Joshua and in Judges I (Jos. XVII 13, Ju. I 28)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. VI 1)

1: E (Ex. I 21)

1: JE (Gen. XXVII 1)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. XIII 15)

הנה נא -- 6: J (Gen. XII 11, XVI 2, XIX 2,8,19,20)

1: JE (Gen. XXVII 2)

2: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 27,31)

זקנ"ם (old age) -- 3: J (Gen. XXI 2, XXXVII 3, XLIV 20)

1: probably J (Gen. XXI 7)

התוצה -- 6: J (Gen. XIX 17, XXIV 29, XXXIX 12,13,15,18)

2: probably E (Gen. XV 5, Jos. II 19)

2: deuteronomic (Dt. XXIV 11, XXV 5)

מצא חן -- 10: J (Gen. XVIII 3, XIX 19, XXX 27, XXXII 6, XXXIII 8,10,15, XXXIX 4, XLVII 29, L 4)

1: probably J (Gen. XLVII 25)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. VI 8)

1: Gen. XXXIV 11

7: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIII 12,13 (2 occurrences),16,17, XXXIV 9, Dt. XXIV 1)

3: JED (Nu. XI 11,15, XXXII 5)

חסד ואמת -- 3: J (Gen. XXIV 27,49, XLVII 29)

1: probably J (Jos. II 14)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 6)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXXII 11)

עשה חסד -- 5: J (Gen. XIX 19, XXIV 12,14,49, XLVII 29)

3: probably J (Jos. II 12 (2 occurrences),14)

1: the late editor of J in Ju. I 24

3: E (Gen. XX 13, XXI 23, XL 14)

2: deuteronomic (Ex. XX 6, Dt. V 10)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXXII 11)

יצג -- 5: J (Gen. XXX 38, XXXIII 15, XLIII 9, XLVII 2, Ex. X 24)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. XXVIII 56)

יש -- 15: J (Gen. XXIV 23,42,49, XXVIII 16, XXXIII 9, XXXIX 4,5 (2 occurrences),8, XLIII 4,7, XLIV 19,20,26, XLVII 6)

2: probably J (Gen. XLII 2, Ex. XVII 7)

3: E (Gen. XXXI 29, XXXIII 11, Nu. XIII 20)

1: JE (Gen. XLII 1)

4: deuteronomic (Dt. XIII 4, XXIX 14,17 (2 occurrences))

3: P (Gen. XXIII 8, Nu. IX 20,21)

2: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 24, Nu. XXII 29)

כבד (as an adjective in all meanings) -- 13: J (Gen. XII 10, XIII 2, XLIII 1, XLVII 4, L 9,10,11, Ex. VII 14, VIII 20, IX 3,18,24, X 14)

2: probably J (Gen. XLVII 13, Ex. X 14)

4: E (Ex. XVII 12, XVIII 18, XIX 16, XX 20)

1: JE (Gen. XLI 31)

1: JED (Nu. XI 14)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IV 10)

כבד (of hardening the heart, whether verb or adjective) --

4: J (Ex. VII 14, VIII 11,28, IX 7)

1: possibly J (Ex. IX 34)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. X 1)

כן-עצ-כי -- 4: J (Gen. XVIII 5, XIX 8, XXXIII 10, Nu. X 31)

1: JE (Nu. XIV 43)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 26

J and P seem to prefer כבד while the deuteronomists prefer עצבן. In E there is little preference for one word rather than the other. The following list will show the situation in the use of the words:

עצב -- 6: J (Gen. XVIII 5, XXIV 45, Ex. VII 14, VIII 11,28, IX 34)

4: the Urgeschichte (Gen. VI 5,6, VIII 21 (2 occurrences,)

4: E (Gen. XXXI 20, L 21, Ex. X 20,27)

2: probably E (Gen. XLII 28, Ex. IX 35)

2: JE (Gen. XXVII 41, XLV 26)

10: deuteronomic (Ex. IV 21, IX 14, X 1 (2 occurrences), Dt. IV 11, XXVIII 65, XXIX 3,18, Jos. XI 20, XIV 8)

2: JED (Nu. XVI 28, XXXII 7)

30: P

1: possibly P (Gen. XXXIV 3)

1: either P or redactional (Ex. XI 10)

1: either E or redactional (Ex. VII 23)

1: Song of the Sea (Ex. XV 8)

3: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IV 14, IX 21, Nu. XXIV 13)

גבר -- 3: E (Gen. XX 5,6, XXXI 26)

1: probably E (Ex. XIV 5)

1: probably E or deuteronomic (Jos. VII 5)

53: deuteronomic

4: P (Lev. XIX 17, XXVI 36,41, Nu. XV 39)

מלון -- 3: J (Gen. XLII 27, XLIII 21, Ex. IV 24)

2: material of uncertain origin (Jos. IV 3,8)

מה זה -- 5: J (Gen. XVIII 13, XXV 22,32, XXXIII 15, Ex. II 20)

1: probably J (Ex. V 22)

1: E (Ex. XVII 3)

1: probably E (Gen. XXXII 30)

1: JE (Nu. XIV 41)

2: JED (Nu. XI 20, Jos. VII 10)

תאן נשלח (with its object the people or Israel) -- 4: J (Ex. VII 14,27, IX 2, X 4)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IV 23)

תהר (as a verb) -- 13: J (Gen. XVIII 6 (2 occurrences),7, XIX 22, XXIV 18,20,46, XXVII 20, XLIII 30, XLIV 11, XLV 13, Ex. II 18, X 16)

1: probably J (Ex. XII 33)

1: E (Gen. XLV 9)

1: probably E (Jos. VIII 14)

2: JE (Gen. XLI 32, Jos. VIII 19)

1: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 8)

1: material of uncertain origin (Jos. IV 10)

(It is to be noted that תהר used as an adverb is not characteristic of J, as the following list will show:

1: E (Jos. X 6)

1: probably E (Jos. II 5)

1: JE (Jos. VIII 19)

10: deuteronomic (Dt. IV 26, VII 4,22, IX 3,12 (2 occurrences),16, XI 17, XXVIII 20, Jos. XXIII 16)

1: P (Nu. XVII 11))

תולדת (kindred) -- 6: J (Gen. XII 1, XXIV 4,7, XXXI 3, XLIII 7, Nu. X 30)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. XI 28)

1: E (Gen. XXXI 13)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXXII 10)

(According to Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 101, in J the word means Verwandtschaft, whereas in P it appears with the meaning Nachkommenschaft.)

תספיא -- 4: J (Gen. XXIV 25,32, XLII 27, XLIII 24)

תקנה -- 16: J (Gen. XIII 2,7, XXVI 14 (2 occurrences), XXIV 7, XXX 29, XXXIII 17, XLVI 32,34, XLVII 6, Ex. IX 3,4,6 (2 occurrences),7,26)

6: probably J (Gen. XLVII 16 (2 occurrences),17 (2 occurrences),18, Ex. XII 38)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV 20)

6: E (Gen. XXXI 9, Ex. IX 19,20,21, XVII 3, Nu. XX 19)

4: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 19, Dt. III 19 (2 occurrences), Jos. I 14)

6: P (Gen. XXXI 18 (2 occurrences), XLVI 6, XLIX 32, Nu. XXXI 9, Jos. XIV 4)

2: possibly P (Gen. XXXIV 5,23)

5: JEDP (Nu. XXXII 1 (2 occurrences),4,16,26)

2: Gen. XXXVI 6,7

1: material of uncertain origin (Jos. XXII 8)

אל -- 49: J

5: probably J (Gen. XVIII 21, XXVII 26, XXXVII 32, XLVIII 9, Jos. II 12)

2: Gen. XXXVIII 16,25

1: the late editor of J in Ju. I 24

12: E

16: probably E

1: P (Nu. XVI 8)

2: possibly P (Gen. XXXIV 8, Nu. XX 10)

9: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIII 13 (2 occurrences),18, XXXIV 9 (2 occurrences), Nu. XIV 17,19, Dt. III 25, IV 32)

4: JE (Gen. XXVII 2,3,9, Nu. XVI 26)

2: JED (Ex. III 18, Nu. XI 15)

11: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 27,30,31,32, XXXII 12, Ex. IV 6,13, XXXII 32, Nu. XXII 6,17, Jos. XXII 26)

נגשׁים -- 1: J (Ex. III 7)

4: probably J (Ex. V 6,10,13,14)

עבד (with suffix, as periphrasis for I, etc.) -- 27: J

5: probably J (Ex. V 15,16 (2 occurrences), Jos. V 14, IX 9)

3: E (Gen. XXXII 19,21, XXXIII 5)

4: probably E (Gen. XLI 10, XLII 10,13, Jos. X 6)

1: JE (Gen. XLII 11)

2: deuteronomic (Dt. III 24, Jos. IX 24)

1: P (Nu. XXXI 49)

6: JEDP (Nu. XI 11, XXXII 4,5,25,27,31)

2: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXXII 11, Ex. IV 10)

אלהי העברים -- 4: J (Ex. VII 16, IX 1,13, X 3)

1: probably E (Ex. V 3)

1: JED (Ex. III 18)

עוד (with pronominal suffix) -- 7: J (Gen. XXIX 9, XLIII 27,28, XLIV 14, XLVI 30, Ex. IX 2,17)

1: E (Gen. XLVIII 15)

1: JED (Nu. XI 33)

2: deuteronomic (Dt. XXXI 27, Jos. XIV 11)

3: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 22, Ex. IV 18, Nu. XXII 30)

עין (fountain) -- 9: J (Gen. XVI 7, XXIV 13,16,29,30,42,43, 45, Ex. XV 27)

1: redactional (Gen. XVI 7)

1: Blessing of Jacob (Gen. XLIX 22)

1: Blessing of Moses (Dt. XXXIII 28)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. VIII 7)

1: P (Nu. XXXIII 9)

על-כן קראשם -- 8: J (Gen. XIX 22, XXV 3, XXIX 34,35, XXXI 48, XXXIII 17, L 11, Ex. XV 23)

1: probably J (Jos. VII 26)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. XI 9)

1: E (Gen. XXX 6)

הפלה -- 3: J (Ex. VIII 18, IX 4, XI 7)

(The verb occurs once in the Niph'al in material which is

probably deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIII 16))

הפעם -- 5: J (Gen. XXIX 34,35, XXX 20, XLVI 30, Ex. X 17)

1: possibly J (Ex. IX 27)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. II 23)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 32)

צאן יבקר -- 12: J (Gen. XII 16, XIII 5, XXIV 35, XXVI 14, XXXII 8, XXXIII 13, XLV 10, XLVI 32, XLVII 1, L 8, Ex. X 9,24)

3: probably J (Gen. XLVII 17, Ex. XII 32,38)

2: E (Gen. XX 14, XXI 27)

2: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIV 3, Dt. XVI 2)

1: JED (Nu. XI 22)

1: possibly P (Gen. XXXIV 28)

1: early material in the Covenant Code (Ex. XX 24)

נפל על-צואר׳ פ׳ -- 2: J (Gen. XXXIII 4, XLVI 29)

1: probably J (Gen. XLV 14)

הצליח -- 7: J (Gen. XXIV 21,40,42,56, XXXIX 2,3,23)

2: deuteronomic (Dt. XXVIII 29, Jos. I 8)

צעל -- 4: J (Gen. XXV 23, XXIX 26, XLIII 33, XLVIII 14)

4: non-J material of Gen. XIX (vv. 31,34,35,38)

1: material of uncertain origin (Jos. VI 26)

קרא בשם יהוה -- 3: J (Gen. XII 8, XXI 33, XXVI 25)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV 26)

2: deuteronomic (Ex. XXXIII 19, XXXIV 5)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XIII 4)

וירא והנה -- 8: J (Gen. XVIII 2, XIX 28, XXIV 63, XXVI 8, XXIX 2, XXXIII 1, XXXVII 25, Ex. III 2)

1: probably J (Jos. V 13)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. VIII 13)

1: E (Gen. XXII 13)

1: probably E (Jos. VIII 20)

2: P (Gen. I 31, VI 12)

רוץ -- 9: J (Gen. XVIII 2,7, XXIV 17,20,28,29, XXIX 12,13, XXXIII 4)

1: probably J (Gen. XLI 14)

1: probably E (Jos. VIII 19)

1: possibly E or deuteronomic (Nu. XI 27)

1: JE (Jos. VII 22)

1: P (Nu. XVII 12)

רוץ לקראת -- 4: J (Gen. XVIII 2, XXIV 17, XXIX 13, XXXIII 4)

הרע -- 6: J (Gen. XIX 7,9, XLIII 6, XLIV 5, Ex. V 22,23)

2: E (Gen. XXXI 7, Nu. XX 15)

2: JED (Nu. XI 11, XVI 15)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. XXVI 6)

1: P (Lev. V 4)

1: material of uncertain origin (probably not E) (Jos. XXIV 20)

לא נשאר -- 3: J (Ex. VIII 27, X 19,26)

2: probably J (Gen. XLVII 18, Ex. XIV 28)

1: probably E (Jos. VIII 17)

שכחה -- 15: J (Gen. XII 16, XVI 1,2,5,6,8, XXIV 35, XXX 10, 12,43, XXXII 6, XXXIII 1,2,6, Ex. XI 5)

1: probably J (Gen. XXXII 23)

1: E (Gen. XX 14)

1: possibly E or redactional (Gen. XXX 18)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. XXVIII 68)

9: P (Gen. XVI 3, XXV 12, XXIX 24 (2 occurrences),29 (2 occurrences), XXXV 25,26,Lev. XIX 20)

3: probably P (Gen. XXX 4,7,9)

שקף -- 4: J (Gen. XVIII 16, XIX 28, XXVI 8, Ex. XIV 24)

1: E (Nu. XXIII 28)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. XXVI 15)

1: material of uncertain origin (Nu. XXI 20)

(2) Phrases <u>not</u> characteristic of J, but sometimes erroneously so considered

אב״ מ׳ (in genealogical tables) -- 4: the <u>Urgeschichte</u> (Gen. IV 20,21, X 21, XI 29)

1: genealogy of uncertain origin (Gen. XXII 21)

אדמה -- 7: J (Gen. XII 3, XIX 25, XXVIII 14,15, Ex. III 5, VIII 17, X 6)

12: probably J (Gen. XLVII 18,19 (4 occurrences),20,22 (2 occurrences),23 (2 occurrences),26 (2 occurrences))

24: the Urgeschichte

1: E (Nu. XII 3)

4: JED (Nu. XI 12, XVI 30,31, XXXII 11)

40: deuteronomic

5: P(Gen. I 25, VI 20, IX 2, Lev. XX 24,25)

2: Covenant Code (early material) (Ex. XX 24, XXIII 19)

1: parallel section from Ex. XXXIV 26

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 43)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. XXXII 12)

אונ״ -- 4: J (Gen. XVI 2, XXIV 5,39, XLIII 12)

3: E (Gen. XXXII 21, Nu. XXIII 3,27)

2: possibly E (Gen. XXVII 12, Jos. IX 7)

1: deuteronomic (Jos. XIV 12)

10: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 24,28,29,30, 31,32, Ex. XXXII 30, Nu. XXII 6,11,33)

אחין (the second of two, after the first has been named) --

1: J (Gen. XXV 26)

2: the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV 21, X 25)

1: genealogy of Gen. XXII 21

2: Gen. XXXVIII 29,30

אל־ה or אל־ -- 4: J (Gen. XVI 8, XVIII 9, XIX 5, Ex. II 20)

2: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 9, IV 9)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 21

1: E (Gen. XXII 7)

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 37)

Holzinger notes on p. 95 of his Hexateuch "es wird vielfach behauptet, J sage nicht אֲנִי, sondern stets אָנֹכִי," and he refers to Wellhausen's Composition, pp. 23, 28,36,60. He goes on to show, however, that this is not wholly true. The following lists will clinch the argument:

אני -- 9: J (Gen. XVIII 13, XXIV 45, XXVIII 13, XXXI 44,52, XXXIII 14, XLV 4, Ex. VII 17, XI 4)

4: probably J (Gen. XXVII 24,32,34, Jos. V 14)

2: material which may be J or possibly redactional (Ex. VIII 18, IX 27)

2: Gen. XXXIV 30 (2 occurrences)

2: the late editor of J at the end of Joshua and in Ju. I (Jos. XVII 14, Ju. I 3)

12: E (Gen. XXII 5, XXXVII 30 (2 occurrences), XL 16, XLI 9,11,15, XLII 37, XLV 3, L 19, Ex. II 9, Nu. XX 19)

5: probably E (Gen. XXVII 38, XXXVII 10, XLII 18, XLVIII 22, Jos. VIII 5)

14: deuteronomic (Gen. XV 7, Ex. IV 21, IX 14, X 1,2, XIII 15, XV 26, XXXIII 16,19, XXXIV 10, Nu. XIV 21, Dt. XII 30, XXIX 5, Jos. XXIII 2)

1: JED (Ex. XVI 12)

2: JE (Gen. XXVII 8, XLI 44)

112: P

3: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XIV 23, XVIII 17, XLIII 14)

3: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 21,39 (2 occurrences))

אנכי -- 28: J

3: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 11, IV 9, VII 4)

2: Gen. XXXVIII 17,25

20: E

8: probably E (Gen. XV 1,2, XXI 26, XXVII 11,19, XLVIII 21, Jos. VII 20, XI 6)

1: JE (Gen. XXXVII 16)

69: deuteronomic

4: JED (Nu. XI 12 (2 occurrences),14,21)

1: P (Gen. XXIII 4)

11: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 27, XXXII 12, Ex. IV 10,11,12,15, XIX 9, XXXII 18, Nu. XXII 30,32, Jos. XXIV 15)

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 40)

באכה -- 1: J (Gen. XIII 10)

3: the Urgeschichte (Gen. X 19 (2 occurrences),30)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXV 18)

צבאת -- 4: J (Gen. XIX 21, Ex. VIII 18,25, IX 17)

2: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 11, IV 15)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 9

1: E (Ex. XX 20)

5: P (Lev. XVIII 30, XX 4, XXVI 15, Nu. IX 7, Jos. XXII 25)

5: deuteronomic (Dt. IV 21, VIII 11, XII 23, XVII 12,20)

1: JED (Nu. XXXII 9)

בנות (villages) -- 13: late editor of J at the end of Joshua and in Ju. I (Nu. XXXII 42, Jos. XVII 11 (6 occurrences),16, Ju. I 27 (5 occurrences))

3: P (Jos. XV 45,47 (2 occurrences))

2: material of uncertain origin (Nu. XXI 25,32)

יהוה אל -- 4: J (Gen. XII 12, XLVI 33, Ex. I 10, Nu. X 32)

1: E (Ex. III 21)

1: probably E (Jos. VIII 5)

12: deuteronomic (Ex. XII 25,26, XIII 5,11,14, XXII 26 (early dt. in the CC), Dt. VI 10, XI 29, XV 16, XXVI 1, XXX 1, XXXI 21)

3: P (Lev. V 5,23, Jos. XXII 28)

זבת חלב ודבש -- 11: deuteronomic (Ex. III 8,17, XIII 5, XXXIII 3, Dt. VI 3, XI 9, XXVI 9,15, XXVII 3, XXXI

20, Jos. V 6)

1: possibly E or deuteronomic (Nu. XIII 27)

3: JED (Nu. XIV 8, XVI 13,14)

1: P (Lev. XX 24)

זקני (of the elders of Israel) -- 3: E (Ex. XVII 5,6, XVIII 12)

1: possibly E (Ex. XXIV 14)

26: deuteronomic

6: possibly E or deuteronomic (Nu. XI 24,25,30, Jos. VII 6, VIII 10, XXIV 1)

5: JED (Ex. III 16,18, Nu. XI 16 (2 occurrences), XVI 25)

4: P (Lev. IV 15, IX 1, XX 4, XXIV 31)

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 7)

טרם -- 4: J (Gen. XIX 4, XXIV 15,45, Ex. X 7)

1: probably J (Jos. II 8)

2: the Urgeschichte (Gen. II 5 (2 occurrences))

2: probably E (Ex. XII 34, Jos. III 1)

1: JED (Nu. XI 33)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IX 30)

ידע (euphemistically) -- 3: J (Gen. XIX 5,8, XXIV 16)

3: the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV 1,17,25)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 26

2: P (Nu. XXXI 17,35)

ישב בקרב פ׳ -- 1: J (Gen. XXIV 3)

2: probably J (Jos. IX 16,22)

6: the late editor of J at the end of Joshua and in Ju. I (Jos. XIII 13, XVI 10, Ju. I 29,30,32,33)

2: probably E (Jos. VI 25, IX 7)

1: deuteronomic (Dt. XXIII 17)

הבה (as interjection) -- 1: J (Ex. I 10)

3: the Urgeschichte (Gen. XI 3,4,7)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 16

ילד (beget) -- 9: the Urgeschichte (Gen. IV 18 (3 occurrences), X 8,13,15,24 (2 occurrences),26)

2: genealogies of uncertain origin (Gen. XXII 23, XXV 3)

(Brown, Driver, Briggs Hebrew Lexicon, p. 408, comments that P makes use of the Hiph'il while J uses the Qal.)

מה-זה or מה-זאת -- 3: J (Gen. XII 18, XXVI 10, Ex. XIV 11)

1: probably J (Gen. XXVII 20)

1: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 13)

2: E (Gen. XXIX 25, XLII 28)

1: probably E (Ex. XIV 5)

2: deuteronomic (Ex. XIII 14, Ju. II 2)

1: material of uncertain origin (Ex. IV 2)

תיך מצרים (an equivalent of Pharaoh, with that word unexpressed) -- 1: J (Gen. XL 1)

1: probably J (Ex. II 23)

3: E (Ex. I 15,17,18)

1: probably E (Ex. V 4)

1: possibly E or deuteronomic (Ex. III 19)

1: JED (Ex. III 18)

בעבור -- 4: J (Gen. XII 13,16, XXVI 24, XLVI 34)

2: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 17, VIII 21)

2: probably E (Gen. XXI 30, XXVII 19)

3: JE (Gen. XXVII 4,10,31)

7: deuteronomic (Ex. IX 14,16 (2 occurrences), XIII 8, XIX 9, XX 20 (2 occurrences))

4: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XVIII 26,29,31,32)

עצב -- 1: J (Gen. XLV 5)

5: the Urgeschichte (Gen. III 16 (2 occurrences),17, V 29, VI 6)

1: material of uncertain origin (Gen. XXXIV 7)

פוץ -- 1: probably J (Ex. V 12)

4: the Urgeschichte (Gen. X 18, XI 4,8,9)

4: deuteronomic (Nu. X 35, Dt. IV 27, XXVIII 64, XXX 3)

1: Blessing of Jacob (Gen. XLIX 7)

פרץ (as a verb) -- 3: J (Gen. XXVIII 14, XXX 30,43)

1: Gen. XXXVIII 29

1: E (Ex. I 12)

2: probably E (Ex. XIX 22,24)

בקרב (of Yahweh in Israel or Egypt) -- 1: probably J (Ex. XVII 7)

2: possibly E or deuteronomic (Ex. III 20, Jos. XXIV 5)

11: deuteronomic (Ex. VIII 18, X 1, XXXIII 3,5, XXXIV 9, Dt. I 42, VI 15, VII 21, XXIII 15, XXXI 17, Jos. III 10)

3: material of uncertain origin (Nu. XIV 11,14, Jos. III 5)

2: JED (Nu. XI 20, XIV 42)

שאול -- 2: J (Gen. XLIV 29,31)

2: probably J (Gen. XXXVII 35, XLII 38)

2: JE (Nu. XVI 30,33)

1: Song of Moses (Dt. XXXII 22)

b. Grammar

While there are a good many words in J's vocabulary which distinguish him from the other writers of the Hexateuch, there are not very many grammatical peculiarities in his writing which are of assistance to the critic in his analysis of the documents. Holzinger, on pages 106-108 of his Hexateuch, however, presents a discussion of such grammatical usages as have often been attributed to J. The

following paragraphs are based upon his work.

It seems to be characteristic of J to employ the verbal suffix more often than the Nota accusative (את) with a suffix, and in this respect he differs clearly from E, as has been observed in Chapter II. Of course there is no exclusive use of one expression rather than the other in either document, but a preference for the verbal suffix is to be noticed frequently in the J document.

There are also certain peculiarities in the construction which J employs with certain verbs. In particular, the verbs חִבֵּק and נָשַׁק (in the Qal) in J are construed with the accusative, while E uses חִבֵּק and נשק (in the Pi'el) with the object introduced by ל. It is sometimes said that the expression שתע לקול פ׳ is a distinctive mark of the J document, but while J does use it in Gen. XVI 2, none of the other occurrences of the phrase are from passages of his writing.[1] It is therefore not to be considered a characteristic expression of J.

Certain constructions with nouns occur more frequently in J than elsewhere. The genitive may be expressed by the use of the circumlocution אשר ל (i.e. by a relative clause), instead of by the use of a noun in the construct state followed by another dependent noun. תעט likewise is used by

1. Gen. III 17 (the Urgeschichte), Ex. III 18 (JED), IV 8,9 (material of uncertain origin), XV 26 (deuteronomic), XVIII 24 (E).

J with a following genitive, whereas in deuteronomic sections a noun in the construct state precedes it.

The usage in respect to certain names of peoples should be mentioned in the discussion of J's grammatical peculiarities. J designates the people of Israel most often by the singular name יִשְׂרָאֵל, while E, on the contrary, prefers the expression בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and the deuteronomists עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל. Likewise J uses the word מִצְרַיִם in the singular in speaking of the Egyptian people; and similarly he prefers the singular for the designation of the separate tribes of Israel, if to him rather than to the editor of the chapter can be attributed that characteristic which occurs frequently in Judges I. In the same way, likewise, the other peoples or tribes are designated in that chapter by the singular of the tribal name (הַכְּנַעֲנִי, הַיְבוּסִי, הָאֲשֵׁרִי). No great weight, however, should be laid on these expressions in Judges I, since it is difficult to ascertain what part of the chapter is the editor's own work, and how many of the expressions the editor found existing in his J source.

c. Style

In literary style the Yahwist surpasses not only all of the writers of the Hexateuch, but most of the writers of the whole Old Testament as well. He is to be compared

I sits a following positive, whereas in deuteronomic sections a noun in the construct state precedes it.

The usage in respect to certain names of peoples should be mentioned in the discussion of J's grammatical peculiarities. J designates the people of Israel most often by the singular noun עם, while E, on the contrary, prefers the expression בני ישראל, and the deuteronomists העם. Likewise J uses the word גוי in the singular in speaking of the Egyptian people; and similarly he prefers the singular for the designation of the separate tribes of Israel, if to him rather than to the editor of the chapter can be attributed that characteristic which occurs frequently in Passages I. In the same way, likewise, the other peoples or tribes are designated in that chapter by the singular of the tribal name (אדום, מואב, עמון). No great weight, however, should be laid on these expressions in Passages I, since it is difficult to ascertain what part of the chapter is the editor's own work, and how many of the expressions are mere forms existing in his J source.

6. Style

In literary style the Yahwist surpasses not only all of the writers of the Hexateuch, but most of the writers of the whole Old Testament as well. He is to be compared

with Homer as one of the outstanding epic writers of the world; and as such it is very important that a discussion of his narrative art be presented here, although in so difficult an undertaking the essence of his work is certain to be lost.

The unity of J's work in spite of the variety of the materials which constitute its parts is distinctive of the epic. From the opening paragraph in Gen. XII in which the future of the Israelitic people is foretold, unfolding incident by incident, while now and again a seemingly disastrous blockade appears in the way, yet triumphantly passing on always stronger for the difficult struggle, the history of Yahweh's people is presented by a man thrilled by the message of optimism which he has to offer to his people. The glory of the fundamental promise to the patriarchs and their seed binds together all the work, and the reader ever anticipates through the stories of Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers the stories of the conquest and settlement in Joshua and Judges. Not only, however, by this recurring motif does J bind together his epic, but the separate stories of his narrative are ably interwoven. Gen. XIII is introductory to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. XIX) on the one hand, since it demands that the selfishness of Lot be recompensed, and to Gen. XVI and XVIII on the other, since it desires to know how Abraham's

generosity met its reward in the birth of children and the expressed approval of the deity. By Abraham's provision for the future of his son in Gen. XXIV the transition to the group of stories around Isaac is effected; and the narrative passes rapidly to the fortunes of Jacob and Esau by showing in chapter XXV how sons were born to Isaac and Rebekah in fulfilment of the first promise to Abraham. While in this way throughout the epic it could be shown that the unity of J's work is a result of skilful planning, J's method in this matter is to be distinguished sharply from that of P, who also has planned his material with care. P's unadorned outline is the most prominent part of his work, while J's is concealed by the interesting incidents which never fail to come from his pen. Even when he lists the sons born to his characters no cold genealogical table is given, as always in P, but stories are told, as in Gen. XXIX and XXX, presenting the factors in the situation which make the births of these children particularly significant. In Gen. XXIX and XXX Jacob's partiality for Rachel and dislike of Leah are the determining factors which make Leah's good fortune in being the mother of the larger number of children seem a fair result to the interested reader. In Gen. XXV the account of the birth of Jacob and Esau is accompanied by a story of how Jacob was only the second born, whereas it was to have been expected that he,

as the inheritor of the promises to his fathers, would have been the first born of the twins. Thereby the readers' interest is stimulated to discover in the succeeding stories how such an unnatural result came about. It is this consistent habit on the part of J of covering his outline with concealing incidents which makes it extremely doubtful whether the genealogies of Gen. XXII 20-24 and XXV 1-4, which often are attributed to that source, do in reality come from him. The characteristic of J which, it has just been shown, distinguishes this author's well planned narrative from the later careful work of the priestly school has been well stated by Carpenter and Harford.[1] In speaking of the narratives of J they say, "the breath of poetry sweeps through them; and though they are set in a historic frame which distinctly implies a reflective effort to conceive the course of human things as a whole, they have not passed into the stage of learned arrangement; they still possess the freshness of the elder time." While J has succeeded throughout his epic in interweaving the incidents so that the continuity of the narrative is never broken, his ability to organize his material in one developing story is clearer in some places than in others. It is particularly well developed in the Joseph stories, as Gunkel (Genesis, p. 357 f.) brings out. "Während sonst,"

1. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 185.

he says, "die einzelnen Sagen des Kranzes .... wie aufgereihte Perlen neben einanderstehen, und der verbindende Faden sehr zurücktritt, ist die Josepherzählung ein wol organisiertes Ganze. Und während sich in den anderen Sagenkränzen die Einzelsagen, die der ganzen Composition zu Grunde liegen, stets sehr scharf von einander abgrenzen lassen, kann man in der Josephgeschichte nur an einzelnen Stellen stärkere Absätze erkennen." Whether this characteristic of the narrative at this point is a result of the different origin of the Joseph stories from the other portions of the epic, as Gunkel would suggest in his commentary, or whether it is a result of the author's particular delight in those stories, which caused him to exert his full artistic ability at that point, is a question to which we can give no conclusive answer.

It has been noted above that J employs a number of words which distinguish him from the rest of the authors of the Hexateuch. In the discussion of his vocabulary, however, its richness and variety was not emphasized, and in this section on J's style it is important that this decided characteristic of J's literary art be recognized. Never is J's writing labored, but while retaining a delightful simplicity, the author employs the words most suited to present the mood and situation of his story. Carpenter and Harford have remarked (p. 186), "the phraseology of J, especially in all that concerns the

divine action, is direct, vigorous, and varied. It has its distinctive turns of speech, but it does not fall into set formulae; it coins new phrases for new situations, frequently uses uncommon words, and possesses a wide range of vocabulary." In his choice of details J reveals himself a discriminating artist. As G.F. Moore has said,[1] "he tells his story directly, swiftly, with almost epic breadth, and with just that measure of detail which gives the note of reality, never overloading the story with circumstance. Nor is it only the external action which he causes thus vividly to pass before us; with the dramatic instinct of the true story-teller he makes us spectators of the inner play of feeling and motive." In this respect the narratives of Gen. XII 10-20 and XX, the former from J, and the latter from E, can be compared again, as has been done heretofore in Chapter II. In the J narrative the background of the whole story is shown by the simple conversation in XII 10-13. E, however, with less appreciation of the narrator's art summarizes these verses in two of his own (XX 1,2), until not only is the hearer's delight in Abraham's cleverness and Sarah's beauty lost -- two features which were particularly pleasant in the story as told by J -- but a full understanding of the story is impossible, because insufficient information concerning

1. Moore, Literature of the Old Testament, p. 37.

the situation is offered by the author. As further illustration of this point it may be asked how much more effective details could have been chosen by J for presenting the Israelites' ideals of a hospitable gentleman than in the story of Abraham and his three guests by the oaks of Mamre (Gen. XVIII). Or how much more effective could J have been in choosing details to describe Isaac's gracious and obliging wife, Rebekah, who is presented in Gen. XXIV as the ideal for all Israelitish women? Similarly in Gen. XXIX 2-14, and in Ex. II 15-22 J's ability to choose words appropriate to the occasion, while retaining an entire simplicity of expression, can be clearly observed. While J, with his ability as a story-teller, has a fine appreciation of the value of details, at the same time he neglects many minor details which do not seem to him to hold much of interest. In this respect the precision of E in regard to the names of minor characters is particularly to be considered, a matter which has already been discussed somewhat fully in the preceding chapter. Doubtless J, if he was acquainted with the names which E included in his work, felt that their use in his narrative would divert his readers' attention to unessentials.

In spite of J's delight in details there is practically no use of description at any point in his epic. All the impressions are gained from the sequence of events, and from cleverly constructed dialogues, but the appearance

of the characters or of the country where the scene of action is laid is left to the readers' imagination. As Skinner says with regard to Gen. XIX 23-28, "Brevity[1] in the description of physical phenomena is in accord with the spirit of the Hebrew legend, whose main interest is the dramatic presentation of human character and action." It is for this reason that we find simply the statement in Gen. XII 11 that Sarai was "a fair woman to look upon," and in Gen. XXIV 16 that Rebekah was "very good in appearance," and again in Gen. XXXIX 6 that Joseph was "a goodly person and well favored." Yet the accompanying anecdotes are sufficiently vivid so that a surprisingly distinct impression of these characters is gained by the reader and no lack at all is felt as the narrative progresses. Taking the place of the careful description which many writers use to bring vividness into their narratives, the conversations skilfully and briefly presented by J, and likewise the heroes' own actions give all the information required by the reader in a vitally interesting way. Thus in Gen. XII 10-20, when the author desired his readers to understand that Abram was clever and Sarai fair he proved by Abram's remark to his wife in vv. 10-13 that he was of ready wit, and as a result of Abram's attitude toward Sarai and the later attitude of the Egyptians

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 309.

toward the woman her remarkable beauty seemed as clear as though it had been described in many words. Also in Gen. XVI Sarai's jealousy of Hagar, Abram's easy-going acquiescence in his wife's desires, and the fortunes of the injured slave girl are presented by a series of conversations between the characters which reveal more clearly and briefly than would have been possible from a description the underlying motives and nature of the characters in this incident. This avoidance, however, of description of the physical appearance or of the feelings motivating the actors in the stories and the presentation in its place of a great amount of direct discourse is by no means peculiar to the author of the J document. It is a characteristic of early story-tellers[1] in which J and E equally share. While, however, the conversations of the characters occupy a very important place in the development of the stories it is to be noted that in the J document all of the speeches are very brief. Occasionally in E a more lengthy statement of a situation which the author wishes to make very clear is placed on the lips of some one of his heroes (cf.,for example, Gen. XXXI 5-13). In the earlier source, however, this more tedious stylistic feature is always avoided.

It is a principle well known to tellers of stories

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. XXIX ff.

to children that repetition brings a great delight to the hearers. So J has recognized; and in many places in his narrative he has repeated earlier sections of his story, yet always with a certain amount of pleasant variation. He emphasizes particularly Yahweh's blessing and promises to the patriarchs. The promise appears first in Gen. XII 2 and 3, in very different words, but with the same underlying idea, in XIII 14-17, again in a still different expression in XXVI 3abβ and 4aαb, and yet once more in XXVIII 13-15. In chapter XXIV there is a large amount of repetition within a single narrative. The first 27 verses of the chapter are subsequently repeated with only a small amount of summarizing in vv. 34-48. These sections, however, form the portion of the chapter which particularly displays Abraham's wealth and the graciousness of the maiden Rebekah, which the author is particularly anxious to present clearly before his readers; and therefore the repetition here not only delights the reader with his childlike joy in hearing things told over and over again, but it betrays the discrimination of the author in presenting the most delightful features of the story in the most prominent place. In Gen. XXIX 32-35 the birth of Leah's first four sons is also presented in a series of verses all of which are expressed in precisely the same way: "And she conceived and bare a son, and said,"

followed by a statement giving the significance of the child's name, and then the concluding remark of each verse, "and she called his name -- ." A bit of variety is introduced into the series by presenting the name of the first-born, Reuben, before the statement which explains it. So J in this section employs a rhythmical repetition of similar phrases but avoids too great a monotony of expression by a judicious use of variation.

Gunkel has made this remark on p. 190 of his commentary on Genesis: "Der Contrast ist in der hebräischen Literatur zu allen Zeiten das am meisten beliebte Stilmittel gewesen; der derbe Geschmack des leidenschaftlichen Hebräers verträgt darin das Stärkste." This remark was evoked by Gen. XIX, and at this point J's sense for contrast is particularly clear. Over against the idyllic charm of the preceding chapter the vulgarity of the story of Sodom and Gomorrah stands forth with great sharpness. In the Joseph stories the value of contrast in enhancing the interest of J's story is brought out well by Gunkel in a comparison of his narrative with that of E, who has shown less appreciation of this literary device.
"Der[1] Tiefpunkt des Elends Josephs," he says, "liegt also bei E darin, dass er als Sklave verkauft worden ist. -- Anders J. J hat diese Tiefe, in die Joseph geführt wurde,

1. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 379.

noch weiter dadurch vertieft, dass er dies Gefängnisleben Josephs noch als ein besonderes Unglück auffasst. So erzählt er: Joseph kann zunächst zu 'einem (ungenannten) ägyptischen Manne:' dort bald in hohem Ansehen und sogar Hausmeier, kam er schliesslich in den Verdacht einer schweren Schuld und ward darum ins Gefängnis geworfen. Hier liegt also der Tiefpunkt des Geschickes Josephs nicht darin, dass er Sklave geworden ist; sondern es ist ihm noch Schlimmeres begegnet: als Sklave ist er noch ins Gefängnis geworfen worden. So wird der Contrast zu seiner folgenden glänzenden Erhebung noch verschärft; und zugleich wird sein Geschick noch bunter und wechselvoller: zuerst Lieblingskind seines Vaters, dann nach Aegypten verkauft, hier zuerst in Ehrenstellung, dann wieder im Elend und zwar jetzt in tiefster Not: im Kerker schmachtend, schliesslich aber erhoben und der Zweite in Aegyptenland. So weiss der Erzähler seine Hörer wechselweise zu ängstigen und zu erfreuen, um dann schliesslich alle Sorge um Joseph von uns zu nehmen." Of the same nature as J's delight in contrast, as Gunkel has clearly shown, is his ability to keep his readers in suspense. While the readers are assured at the opening of the epic that Abram is to have a large posterity, in chapter XVI we learn that because of Sarai's barrenness and the advanced years of both her husband and herself it would appear that the promise had gone astray.

Some hope comes from the son whom Sarai's maid bears to them, but such a fulfilment of the glowing promise which was made at the first seems very inadequate to the readers, and their hope presses on to the fulfilment which comes in chapters XVIII and XXI. Likewise we are told of the future in store for Jacob in his father's land. Yet he is driven far away by his brother and cheated by his uncle Laban. His cleverness, however, which was typical of the Israelitish business man, brings him, in time, success and wealth, and he escapes from Haran, and returns in safety to Canaan. Through the Joseph stories, the account of the oppression in Egypt, the subsequent deliverance, and the trials of Moses's leadership of the people on the journey back to Canaan, the narrator keeps his readers alternating between hope and despair, although always in the background of their consciousness is the remembrance of the divine promise with which the epic began, a surety to them that the nation of which they are a part will in its due time become dominant in the world.

This mood of optimism prevails throughout the epic. Now it takes delight in occasional bits of humor, as, for example, the story in Gen. XXV 29-34[1] of the way in which the crafty Jacob fooled his stupid, hungry brother, or the

1. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 271, although the passage is here attributed to E.

story in Gen. XXVII[1] of Jacob's later ruse in impersonating Esau before his blind father Isaac. In this respect J differs from E, to whom, as Luther says, "das Humoristische frivol erscheint."[2] At times the author's joy in his message makes him almost lyrical, as particularly in the presentation of the promises in Gen. XII 1-4, XIII 14-17, and the J material of Gen. XXVIII. Yet J is not prevented thereby, when the exigencies of his material demand it, from a serious presentation of misfortune or grief. No touch could be gentler or sympathy deeper than in J's appreciation of Jacob's fatherly anxiety and of Judah's intercession for the safety of his brother (Gen. XLIII, XLIV). And in his serious mood J is always an artist. In contrast to E he never becomes didactic at the expense of a story's charm (cf. Chapter II). As Holzinger has said, certainly J's "Erzählungen[3] sind durchzogen von religiösen und sittlichen Grundgedanken, aber nicht weil sie den Zweck haben, diese Gedankendem Leser nahe zu legen; dieselben kommen vielmehr im einzelnen ungesucht und unwillkürlich zum Ausdruck, einfach weil sie im Gemüt und in der Vorstellungswelt des Erzählers oder der Erzähler

1. Gunkel, op. cit., p. 282.

2. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 111.

3. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 117.

lebendig sind und eine wichtige Rolle spielen." Whether J's narratives are sober or joyous, however, there is a strain through the whole that reveals the steady faith of the author in the success of Yahweh's purpose for Israel. And this faith, shining through even the disheartening days of the people's lack of confidence in Moses's leadership, furnishes the dynamic power which evokes the heights of eloquence and artistic perfection to be found in the J document.

CHAPTER VI.

RELIGION

The importance of religion in the epic of J makes it natural that the present discussion should consider with care the religious characteristics of that document. As Trabaud has said, "J et E ne sont pas des historiens au sens propre du terme, mais plutôt des narrateurs avides de conserver à leur peuple le souvenir de son passé et de faire circuler dans son sein, par le moyen de ces traditions, un courant de vie religieuse et nationale."[1] And J in particular would present to his readers his faith in Yahweh, who, he can show, has from time immemorial cared for the nation of Israel.

What, then, are the characteristics of this deity who holds so important a place in the narrative of J? He is first and foremost the god who by the name Yahweh has revealed himself to the patriarchs and who has been worshipped by them in return ever since Abraham, the father of the race.[2] As has been said already in Chapter II, this conception is at variance with the tradition of the other Hexateuchal writers, who think that only in the time of Moses did the name Yahweh come to be known by Israel. Various reasons which critics have advanced as possible

1. Trabaud, L'Introduction à l' Ancien Testament, p. 52.

2. Note that Gen. XII is considered by the present writer the beginning of the J document.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The importance of religion in the life of a nation is such that the present discussion should consider with care the religious characteristics of that document. As Trahaud has said, "L'étude des documents historiques ne sera propre à leur peuple le souvenir de son passé et de faire ériger dans son sein, par le moyen de ces traditions, un courant de vie nationale et rationnelle." And if the particular month present in this pattern this fight in Tehran. Now, in our day, are from time immemorial erred for the nation of Israel.

But, then, are the characteristics of this daily mo Nalse as important a place in the narrative of Ty. Ze is first sun Ivermost the gos mio by the name Vehmen une revelles limmeld to the prisiteth. no rio has been strain-ned ge time in return ever since Ast mon, the failure of the ram. As has been said already in Chapter II, this con-sation is at variance with the tradition of the other sex tempted triple, the tight that only in day time of hoses the fire rage Vemmy come to be known by Israel. Various reasons which critics have ruggested as possible

1. Trahaud, L'Introduction à l'Ancien Testament, p. 85.

2. Note that den. XII is commended by the present writer the beginning of the I document.

explanations of the different beliefs of E and J have been summarized in the earlier chapter. It will be sufficient at this point to quote the statement by Haller, who in this matter alligns himself with Moore and Barton, whose opinions were mentioned before as particularly reasonable.[1] Haller says, "An ursprüngliches Jahwe lässt sich denken, wenn man den kühnen Schritt tun will, eine doppelte Herkunft des Jahwenamens anzunehmen: nämlich einerseits den Jahwe Moses, dessen Sitz am Sinai ist und daneben einen südpalästinensischen Lokalgott Jahwe, die zurzeit miteinander verschmolzen worden wären. So würde sich wohl auch die starke Betonung des Jahwenamens und des reinen Jahwismus im Südreich erklären, von der gerade J, der neuerdings immer mehr dem Südreich zugeschrieben wird, ein deutliches Zeugnis ablegt, während sonst allerdings Juda im allgemeinen nicht als reiner Israelite gilt." In J, then, throughout the nation's history, Yahweh has been the god par excellence. But while this belief excludes the worship of other deities by all true Israelites it does not imply monotheism on the part of the author. It was not until after the work of the prophets, and the broader view of world affairs which came coincidentally with them, that monotheism, with all the philosophical reasoning that the term implies, was thought of by any one among the people of

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 15.

Israel.

The picture of Yahweh in the pre-Mosaic age is given by J largely by means of the sanctuary stories circulating freely in his day at the popular shrines scattered throughout the land. In them were found many evidences that local divinities were worshipped in the various spots by the residents of the country round about. Thus in Gen. XVIII a story is found, originating at the terebinth of Mamre close by Hebron, in which the patriarch Abraham entertains three men who probably once were local divinities of the place. In Gen. XVI an angel appears to Hagar, who has taken refuge by the spring Beerlahairoi. Here is a story very similar in character to tales of water nymphs in other religions. In Gen. XXXII 25-33 is found a story which clearly at one time concerned the local deity of Penuel and his wrestling match with the hero Jacob. Again in the J material of Ex. III an angel appears to Moses in the midst of a bush; and likewise in Ex. IV 24-26 a very early story which seems once to have concerned a local demon is present. In all of these narratives in the J document, however, the local divinity is identified with Yahweh. J took over the popular tales of his day and with his own interpretation utilized them in his epic. No longer do three divinities appear to Abraham at Hebron (Gen. XVIII); two of them now are men, and the third is Yahweh. The angel at Beerlahairoi (Gen. XVI), or in the flaming bush

Israel.

The pilgrim of Yemen in the pre-Islamic age is given by a literary tradition of the southern stories [illegible] in his day of the northern shrines established throughout the Land. In them were found many evidences that Israel divinities were worshipped in the various guises by the descendants of her country-men [illegible]. Time in Gen. XXXII 2 seems, reflecting the tradition of Israel's close kinship, in Nahor the patriarch Abraham's ancestral home. Hence the probably some sort of divinities of the place. In Num. XXI 1 Arad appears in Negev, the home region of the Kenite metalsmiths. Here is a story very similar in character to tales of serpent cults in other religions. In Gen. XXXII 32-33 is found a story which old try at one time represented the Israel half of Israel's [illegible] with the Hebrew deity. Again in Ex. 4 Midian of Ex. [illegible] in the [illegible] of a God; and likewise in Ex. IV 24-26 a very early story which seems once to have concerned a local demon in [illegible]. In all of these narratives in the O. Testament, however, the Israel divinity is identified with Yahweh. [illegible] take over the popular tales of his [illegible] with an interpretation utilized them in his epic. In Israel we have divinities appear to Abraham at Mamre (Gen. XVIII); one of them was Yahweh, and the third is Yahweh. Jacob wrestled at Peniel (Gen. XXI), as in the Jacob's [illegible]

at Sinai (Ex. III) have become in his mind angels of Yahweh. And in the account of the origin of circumcision (Ex. IV 24-26) it is Yahweh himself who tries to kill Moses.

The simplicity of Yahweh's nature in J, in contrast to the view in E or P, is particularly to be noted. In E God is becoming already too remote to communicate directly with man. Between him and the worshipper must sometimes intervene an indefinite being called an angel, who is simply a partial manifestation of the deity himself; or at times the deity communicates with the individual in person at night through visions or dreams. In P God is still more abstract and transcendant. This author is a monotheist, and his deity is exalted as ruler and creator over the whole world. But in J a simple picture is presented of a deity who speaks in person to the patriarchs. To Abram Yahweh gives the command to go to Canaan (Gen. XII 1), and when the patriarch has arrived at his destination Yahweh appears to him at Shechem (v. 7) and at Bethel (v. 8), where Abram worships him. Likewise to Isaac (Gen. XXVI 24), to Jacob (Gen. XXVIII 13, XXXI 3), and to Moses (Ex. VIII 16, IX 1,13) Yahweh appears in person. No need is felt by the J writer of a mediator between the deity and his worshipper, and therefore in J there are no references, as in E, to angels who simply act as a substitute for Yahweh's presence. In the sanctuary stories which were of popular origin and rested on the prevalent reverence for many local divinities

there is found something which at first seems to resemble E's conception, but in reality these angels are of a very different character, a relic of primitive polytheism. One reference in J can be found (Gen. XXIV 7) where there appears an angel of Yahweh, similar to those found in E. No other such examples, however, are to be observed, and the repeated appearance of Yahweh in person to his worshippers is the striking feature to be noted in J. Illustrative of the simplicity of J's picture of Yahweh is also the expression in Ex.III 8a that Yahweh "comes down" (ירד) to deliver Israel, or in Gen. XVIII 21 (if the verse belongs to J) that he "comes down" to investigate conditions in Sodom and Gomorrah. Yahweh's activities are described in the same terms as those of human beings. A further example of the simplicity of the picture of the deity in J is to be found in a comparison of the stories of J and E of the way in which the people are led through the wilderness. In J Yahweh himself guides them in a pillar of cloud and fire (Ex. XIII 21,22, XIV 19,20), while in E (Ex. XIV 19) an angel directs the group advancing before the camp of Israel. The illustrations which have just been given are often used to show how anthropomorphic is J's conception of the deity. Added support for this view is also found in the stories of the meal which Abraham provides for his divine visitors in Gen. XVIII, of the wrestling match of Jacob and a superhuman opponent in Gen. XXXII, and particular-

ly in the primitive stories of the deity which are found in the Urgeschichte in Gen. I-XI.[1] The latter, of course, are of no concern for the subject since the present investigation has found it unlikely that they are a part of J. The anthropomorphic traits in the former were probably so important a part of the sanctuary stories which J embodied in his work that, while he did not take them seriously, he included them in his epic with appreciation of their picturesqueness. As Moore has explained, "Such extremely human representations belong to the ancient legends which are incorporated in the history; the author's own conception of God .... was much less crude; but it is significant that such traits were allowed to remain with so little change."[2] They are indicative of the simple, as yet not abstract conception of the deity in the mind of the Yahwist.

The very great power of Yahweh is demonstrated, in J's opinion, by the triumphant course which the nation under Yahweh's guidance has followed throughout its history. This directing impulse Yahweh has exerted in person instead of working from a distance through human agents. Thus he gives his command directly to the patriarchs. He himself brings the plagues upon the Egyptians; Moses is merely a messenger who announces his will to the pharaoh; and in J the figure of

1. Cf. also Gen. XIX, Ex. IV 24 ff.

2. Moore, The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 38.

ly in the primitive stories of the deity which are found in the Theogonies in Gen. I-XI.[1] The latter, of course, are of no concern for the subject since the present investigation has found it unlikely that they are a part of J. The anthropomorphic traits in the former were probably so important a part of the sanctuary stories which J recorded in his work that, while he did not take them seriously, he included them in his epic with appreciation of their picturesqueness. As Moore has explained, "Such extremely human supernaturalisms belong to the ancient legends which are incorporated in the history; the authors can conception of God .... was much less crude; but it is significant that such traits were allowed to remain with so little change."[2] They are indicative of the simple, as yet not abstract conception of the deity in the mind of the Yahwist.

The very great power of Yahweh is demonstrated, in J's opinion, by the triumphant course which the nation under Yahweh's guidance has followed throughout its history. This directing impulse Yahweh has exerted in person instead of working from a distance through human agents. Thus he gives his command directly to the patriarchs. He himself brings the plagues upon the Egyptians; Moses is merely a messenger who announces his will to the Pharaoh; and in J the figure of

1. Cf. also Gen. XXI, Ex. IV 24 ff.

2. Moore, The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 58.

Aaron does not appear at all.[1] Such occupation in human affairs, however, involves no small idea of Yahweh's power on the part of J. In this respect "Yahweh ist ihm so erhaben, dass er menschlicher Hilfe nicht bedarf."[2] The elements are at his service to bring about the plagues. An east wind blows in the locusts (Ex. X 13 ff.); a storm destroys all vegetation, the flocks, and the herds (Ex. IX 18 ff.). He lays bare the sea by a strong continued wind that his people may have the opportunity to pass over in safety (Ex. XIV 21ff.). In such dignified actions wherein the supernatural is avoided, Holzinger has explained, "eine geistige Gottesvorstellung liegt namentlich den Wunderberichten dieser Quelle zu Grund."[3] Reflection has not advanced to the point in the J document where the deity has become omnipotent, but in the mind of J he is amply powerful for all of the needs of his worshippers.

Illustrations may be brought of the wide knowledge[4] of Yahweh in J. In Gen. XVIII 13 Yahweh knew that Sarah laughed at the promise which he had made to Abraham, though she was hidden from the others behind the tent door. In the same chapter, if v.20 is authentic, the sin of the villages of Sodom and Gomorrah is also fully apparent to

1. Cf. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 180, and Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 76 f.

2. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 141.

3. Holzinger, op. cit., p. 128.

4. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 37.

I.

Aaron does not appear at all. Some association is made, however, involves no social loss of Moses' power on the part of J. In this respect "Aaron has him to speak, and of wonderful are skills as God intended." The elements are at his service to bring about the plagues. An exception occurs in the Jacobus (Ex. X 12 ff.); a storm destroys all vegetation, the locusts, and the hail (Ex. IX 22 ff.). He lift arms too and by a strong continuous wind that his people may have the opportunity to pass over in safety (Ex. XIV 21). In most illustrated editions showing the supernatural is avoided, darkness -- explained, "eine geheime dotterartigen Light erscheinung den Hundertfachen diesen Qualle an Trans." Reflection has not any more to the point in the J document where the entity has become omnipotent, but in the mind of J he is amply powerful for all of the needs of his for Pharaoh.

Illustrations may be brought of the same knowledge or Yahweh in J. In Gen. XVIII 1 Yahweh has been lounged at the promise which he had made to Abraham, Sarah had her laughter from the angels behind the tent door. In the same chapter, it v.20 is Yahweh, but sin of the villages of Sodom are Gomorrah is more fully accounted by

1. Dr. Gunkel and Herford, The Legislation of the Pentateuch, p. 100, see Kalisch, Pentateuch, p. 28 f.

2. Luther, in Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 241.

3. Holzinger, op. cit., p. 100.

4. Muller, Religion, Rec. / und Offe. in Gen-Exodus, pp. 27.

the deity. And in chapter XVI the angel of Yahweh is aware that the fleeing woman is the maid of Sarai; and he is capable of making known to her the future of her son. Similar to the latter is Yahweh's answer to Rebekah's inquiry in Gen. XXV 22 f. The coming twins are to be the fathers of two nations, the one stronger than the other, and the elder of whom shall serve the younger. Here again there has not been sufficient reflection so that the deity is considered omniscient; but in the mind of J he is wise enough for all the needs of his people.

In J Yahweh is still a national god, to be compared with Chemosh, god of the Moabites. As such he furthers Israel in all of her interests and opposes nations or individuals who would do injury to her. This principle is expressed in the third verse of the epic (Gen. XII 3) "And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee," and thereafter it is acted upon throughout the course of the document. In vv. 10-20 of Gen. XII Yahweh inflicts plagues upon Pharaoh for violating Abram's wife, though it was done in all ignorance on Pharaoh's part and as the direct result of Abram's lie. It was sufficient that an injury had been done to the patriarch, and the Egyptian had to pay a penalty therefor. Similarly, when the Egyptians were oppressing the Israelites, J seems

to have told that it was the suggestion of Yahweh that a ruse be tried to procure their deliverance. A petition was to be made that the people be allowed to go away for three days to celebrate a feast to Yahweh.[1] As Meyer has said,[2] "Nur ist das Fest bei J lediglich Vorwand, um den König zu betrügen und ihm die Erlaubnis zu entlocken, das Volk auf wenige Tage in die Wüste ziehen zu lassen, während E es hier vom Auszug völlig losgelöst hat." The fact that this device involved a lie on the part of the deity offended the author not at all since it advanced the cause of the Israelitish people. Over against these indications of national limitations of the deity in the work of J, numerous expressions of universalism can be found in his narrative. In Gen. XII 3 there is the statement "and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed;" in Gen. XXIV 3 "and I will make thee swear by Yahweh, the god of heaven, and the god of the earth;" in Gen. XXVI 4 "and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" and in Gen. XXVIII 14 "and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." It is to be noted, however, that the statement in Gen. XII 3 stands side by side with the

1. Cf. the J material which probably forms the basis of Ex. III 18, and the J material of Ex. V and Ex. VII 25-28, X 8-10.

2. Meyer, Die Israeliten, p. 8.

opposing statement referred to earlier in this paragraph. The whole verse reads "And I will bless them that bless thee and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Here no overthrow of Yahweh's limitations seems to be foreseen, but the time is rather foretold when Yahweh's power will be world-wide because Israel's influence is to extend to the ends of the earth.

Yahweh is not yet an ethical deity. He appreciates the fine qualities of his worshippers, and rewards or punishes them according to their deserts (cf. Gen. XIII, XVIII, XIX), but the reform movement of the great prophets has not yet taken place which made Yahweh primarily a righteous god. In J he is distinctly bound by the national limitations which have been described in the preceding paragraph. He must support an Israelite right or wrong when he is opposed by a foreigner (Gen. XII 10-20); and he is willing to practise deception to relieve his injured people (See the preceding paragraph). To do otherwise would be to assist another god's worshippers and thus virtually to commit suicide. Neither is Yahweh yet a consistent being. Sin is recognized still by the results of actions rather than on a basis of any ethical standard. Thus in Gen. XLIV 16, when the cup was found in Benjamin's sack, although Joseph's brothers were quite aware that they had done no wrong, they

concluded that some offence had been done the deity which he had found an opportunity to punish. And in Ex. IX 27 and X 16 Pharaoh concluded as a result of the plagues which had come upon him that he had sinned against the deity. Of the meaning of the word <u>righteous</u> in Ex. IX 27 Baentsch says,[1] "הצדיק hier nicht im ethischen Sinne: der Gerechte, sondern, im juristischen Sinne." And a little earlier in his comments on that verse he says, "Pharao fasst die ganze Angelegenheit als eine Art Rechtsstreit auf, der nach dem Grundsatz entschieden wird: Der Stärkere hat Recht." No distinction existed between moral and ceremonial sins, but Yahweh was considered so capricious that in Ex. IV 24-26 he could attempt to kill Moses because of his uncircumcision, although in the story immediately preceding he had chosen him as his special messenger to assist in delivering Israel from Egypt. Once in J there appears the conception, developed further by E, that Yahweh works through an apparent evil to bring an ultimate good. This thought appears only in the fragment in Gen. XLV 5a, however, and since the rest of the verse is from E it is possible that most of a is also from that document. In the J document there is little reflection on matters of ethics. Yahweh's sphere is the well-being of the nation. He is exclusively a national deity.

While the deity in the J document holds a very

1. Baentsch, <u>Exodus</u>, p. 76.

complained that some offence had been done the deity which he had found an opportunity to praise. And in Ex. IX 27 and X 16 Pharaoh considered as a result of the plagues which had come upon him that he had sinned against the deity. Of the meaning of the word righteous in Ex. IX 27 Hempel says, "Pharaoh also meant in Hebrew Sinne: der Gerechte, nämlich im Gerichtlichen Sinne." And a little earlier in his commentary he says, "Pharao lässt sich genau Angelegenheit die eine Art Gerichtsurteil und, der nach den Grundsätzen entscheiden wird: der schuldige hat recht." The distinction existed between moral and governmental sins, but was considered in a religious way in Ex. IX 27-28 as Hebrew thought is still vague because of his unfamiliarity with the strong immoralizing preaching in not choosing him as his special messenger to assist in delivering Israel from Egypt. Once in a while reference to punishment, level-headed further on Ex. that Pharaoh sees through to a correct evil as being a criminal food. This thought appears only in the treatment in vers. XIV 4a, however, the since his first of the verse in Ex. II is a possible dual meaning of a in also Ex. that Jehovah. In the J document there is little reflection on matters of ethics. Yahweh's source is the well-being of his nation. He is exclusively a national deity.

Still the deity in the J document also vers

7. Hempel, Gloaube, p. 75.

important place, the worship which is paid to him is of far less concern. In other religions magic is very prominent, but in J few evidences of its use can be found.[1] Possibly the story of the love apples in Gen. XXX 14 and of the rods which Jacob placed before the sheep in Gen. XXX 37 are examples of a bit of popular magic. It is noticeable, however, in both these cases, that the magical element is thoroughly subordinated to Yahweh's own activity. Worship of Yahweh was carried on at the popular sanctuaries which were scattered over the land. No one spot was exclusively sacred,[2] but wherever the deity was reputed to have appeared an altar was consecrated to him. Sanctuaries were located at sacred trees (Gen. XII 6, XIII 18, XVIII 1, XXI 33), springs (Gen. XVI 7, XXVI 23-25, XXXII 23a,24a,25*), and stones (Gen. XXXI 46,48). The practices which were carried on at these points, however, are seldom mentioned in J. As has been said, J recognized that there were altars at the shrines, the erection of which he attributed to the patriarchs (Gen. XII 7,8, XIII 18, XXVI 25), but he never recorded that sacrifice was offered upon any of them.[3] Recourse seems to have been had to oracles (Gen. XXV 22), yet the religious functionary, the priest, in whose hands the management of the

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 34.

2. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 179.

3. No J material is recognized in the Urgeschichte or Gen. XV.

important place, the worship which is paid to him is of her less concern. In other religions which is very pronounced, but in a few instances of its use can be found. Possibly the story of the love goddess in Ger. XXX 1 and of the gods which Jacob placed before the stars in Gen. XXX 37 are examples of a kind of popular magic. It is noticeable, however, in both these cases, that the magical element is strongly subordinated to Yahweh's own activity. Worship of Yahwehs was carried on at the popular sanctuaries which were scattered over the land. No one spot was exclusively sacred, but wherever the deity was reported to have appeared an altar was consecrated to him. Sanctuaries were located at sacred trees (Gen. XII 6, XIII 18, XVIII 1, XXI 33), springs (Gen. XVI 7, XXVI 23-25, XXXII 22,23,26), and stones (Gen. XXXI 46,48). The practices which were carried on at these places, however, are quite mentioned in J. As has been said, I presumed that such more stress of the sanctuaries, the erection of which is attributed to some particular (Gen. XII 7,8, XIII 18, XXVI 25), one to every recorded act sacrifice was offered upon any of them. Remarks seem to have been then to consider (Gen. XXV 22), yet the religious functionary, the priest, in whose hands the management of the

1. Smith, Religion, Rank und Stand in den Israelitenen, p. 54.

2. Cornill, Der Prophet, Die Geschichte des Israelitischen, p. 173.

3. Much material is recognized in the Dreschnitzer or Gen. IV.

oracle was always left, was not referred to by J. Yahweh himself is said to have given the reply to Rebekah when she went to question him (v. 23). Practices universally recognized in antiquity as necessary whenever a man was about to approach the deity were mentioned occasionally by J in his heroes' experiences. Thus Moses removed his shoes when he beheld the burning bush (Ex. III 5), and Joshua did likewise when approached by the captain of Yahweh's host (Jos. V 15). Moses also is said to have fasted when about to receive the ten words (Ex. XXXIV 28) on Sinai. Such elaborate preparations guaranteed the worshipper from the dangerous quality inherent in the sacredness of deity. The ratification of a covenant between two contracting parties demanded the calling to witness of the god, and this commom practice in ancient times is testified to in the J material of Gen. XXXI 44-53 (cf. particularly v. 53a). The belief in a covenant which had been formed between Yahweh and Israel, however, is of later origin. As Wellhausen has said,[1] "Only when the existence of Israel had come to be threatened by the Syrians and Assyrians, did such prophets as Elijah and Amos raise the Deity high above the people, sever the natural bond between them, and put in its place a relation depending on conditions, conditions of a moral character." Circumcision holds little importance in J, but a brief account of the origin of this rite appears to

1. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, p. 417.

be given in the very ancient tale in Ex. IV 24-26. The application of the ban in a time of emergency, a religious custom intended to insure a more forceful participation of the deity on the side of his worshippers, is described by J in the activities against the Canaanites at Hormah (Nu. XXI 1-3), and probably in the J story of Achan, only remnants of which are now left in Jos. VII. All of these references to practices connected with the worship of Yahweh are scattered and unobtrusive in the J document, a characteristic of this source which seems the more remarkable in view of the importance which Yahweh himself holds in the mind of the author. It is likewise very striking in contrast with E, where the details of worship play an important part. In the latter document sacrifice is frequent (Gen. XXII, XLVI 1, Ex. XVIII). The furnishings of the sanctuary include not only altars, as in J, but sacred stones or mazzebahs, which are respectfully anointed with oil (Gen. XXVIII, XXXI 51,52, XXXV 20). Added ceremony before approaching the deity is insisted upon by E (cf. Ex. XIX and XXXIII). And the priests, who never appear at all in J, play in the later source an important part; the founder of the Israelite nation, Moses, is described with all the functions of a priest.[1] The place of this ritual is taken in J by the recourse of the worshippers to prayer. When the altar at Bethel has been completed Abraham "calls upon the name of Yahweh" (Gen. XII 8), as also the patriarch

1. Hölscher, Die Profeten., p. 109 f.

Abraham (or Isaac)[1] does at Beersheba by a grove sacred to אל עולם יהוה (Gen. XXI 33). Isaac likewise does the same after the erection of an altar at Beersheba at a spot where Yahweh had appeared to him (Gen. XXVI 25). A more detailed description of the use of prayer in a time of perplexity is given in Gen. XXIV 11 ff. Here the servant of Abraham resorts to prayer in an attempt to fulfil his master's charge faithfully. Haller discusses this section as follows:[2] "Interessant sind die Gründe, die den Knecht in c. 24[12] zum Gebet veranlassen: es ist die Lage, in der er sich nicht zu helfen weiss, wo es sich um Stammeswohlfahrt und gutes Ergehen seines Herrn handelt, daher das Erkennungszeichen einer guten Hausfrau gefordert wird (24[14] J); auch dieses Gebet dreht sich um sinnliche Güter, die allerdings zum Teil sittlichen Gehalt haben." This emphasis on prayer in the religion of J, while the external elements of the religion are subordinated, and not even the festivals are recognized as a part of the worship of[3]

1. Cf. the analysis of Gen. XXI.

2. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 83.

3. Note that all references to the sabbath in Ex. XVI and XXXIV, and the sections concerning the institution of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Ex. XII have been discarded from J in the analysis of the document. Also the references to the ark in Nu. X 33-36, which by some critics (cf. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 96) are attributed to J, are in the present analysis considered partly E and partly the work of later writers. Cf. Arnold, W.R. Ephod and Ark, p. 139.

Abraham (or Isaac) lost at Moriahbon by a grave caused to [illegible] (Gen. XXI 27). Isaac likewise then has same offer the mention of an altar at Beersheba, at a spot where Jahweh had appeared to him (Gen. XXVI 23). A more detailed description of the use of prayer in a time of perplexity is given in Gen. XXIV 12 ff. Here the servant of Abraham resorts to prayer in an attempt to fulfill his master's choice faithfully. Haller discusses this section in [illegible]: "Interessant sind die Gebete, die den Kaufmann in c. 24[12] zum Gott vorenthalten: es ist die Frage, in der er [illegible] nicht zu helfen weiss. Wo es sich um Hammerschlicht und gutes Gewissen handelt, kann [illegible] Gebet eine Zweideutigkeit [illegible] (Gen 47); auch dieses Gebet [illegible] die [illegible] Gebet, die [illegible] zu [illegible]." Die [illegible] in der Religion of J, [illegible] external elements of the religion are subordinated, and not even the [illegible] are recognized as a part of the morality of

1. Gf. The analysis of Gen. XXI.

2. Haller, Religion, Ge. + und Stäne in den Genesisquellen, p. 87.

3. Here does all reference to the symbols in Ex. XVI and XXIV, and the passions concerning the institution of the Passover and the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Ex. XII have been disarmed from J in the analysis of the document. Also the references to the ark in Nu. X 35-36, which for some reason (cf. Procksch, Die Elohimquelle, p. 60) are attributed to J, are in the current analysis considered purely E and "only the work of later redactors." Cf. Smend, F.T. Genesis und Exo, p. 129.

Yahweh is a very significant feature in the religion of the J document.

Exactly wherein its significance for the religion of J lies is a question which greatly puzzles students of the Old Testament. Its close resemblance to one of the major emphases of the great prophets has brought many critics to feel that it stands under prophetic influence. Holzinger has commenced his discussion of the religious conceptions of J with the following paragraph: "Die jahwistische Quelle[1] ist nach Ewald's Vorgang von E. Schrader als der prophetische Erzähler bezeichnet und charakterisiert worden. Diese Bezeichnung hat ihr Recht. Es finden sich in dieser Quelle an beherrschender Stelle Gedanken, die völlig auf der Höhe der prophetischen Gotteserkenntnis stehen, überhaupt die Gedankenwelt der Propheten voraussetzen." In discussing the course of J's narrative of the Mosaic period, Carpenter and Harford have also spoken as follows:[2] "In these characteristics of divine faithfulness contrasted again and again with the weariness, the mistrust, the open rebellion, of the Israelites, it is impossible not to recognize in the field of national tradition the profound influence of the motives and conceptions which appear elsewhere in the sphere of early prophecy." Yet if J is in sympathy with the prophetic

1. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 127.

2. Carpenter and Harford, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 179.

Yahweh is a very significant feature in the religion of the Old Testament.

Hardly whether his significance for the religion of Israel is a question which greatly puzzles students of the Old Testament. He alone resembles to one of the major characters of the great prophetic non fiction novel writer in that it remains under prophetic influence. Holzinger has commenced his discussion of the religious conception of Yahweh the following paragraph: "Die jahwistische Quelle ist nach Budde's Vorgange von E. Sellhorn die der prophetischen Kreisen bezeichnet und charakterisiert wurden. Diese Zeugnisse mit ihr Recht. Es finden sich in dieser Quelle so bezeichnender Stelle Jahwehen, die selbst auf den Thron der prophetischen an Gottesvorstellung stehen, Wiederum ist Bedeutungswert der Gottesvorstellung erzählerisch." In discussing the course of J's narrative of the Hebrew people, Cornerstone and Lefevre have spoken as follows: "In these narrative-tales of divine faithfulness contrasted again and again with the weakness, the waitrust, the open rebellion, of the Israelites, it is impossible not to recognize in the field of national tradition the profound influence of the motives and conceptions which appear elsewhere in the sphere of early prophecy." Yet if J is in sympathy with the prophetic

1. Holzinger, Hexateuch, p. 150.

2. Cornerstone and Lefevre, The Composition of the Hexateuch, p. 173.

group it is strange that he omits all references to the prophets. Of course many critics see in the Balaam story (Nu. XXII, XXIV) one reference to a prophet, although outside the nation of Israel. Even this the present discussion considers as material not belonging to the J document. Furthermore, the ethical limitations of J's deity betray a lack of understanding of the foremost field in which the prophets were pioneers. In the moralization of religion the prophets made their greatest contribution, and J shows no influence of such conceptions.

In the matter of possible influence upon J from the priestly group it may be said similarly that there is no reference to the existence of such religious functionaries. In J's "simple cultus[1] there is no need of a priest. Dimly in the background he may wait to receive those who 'go to inquire of Yahweh' 25[22], for the management of the oracle was from of old his duty; but he is not named, and the solitary reference leaves all detail obscure." All the ritual connected with the cult, which would have been of primary concern to the priests, is not permitted to enter J's picture. Yet in the sanctuary stories[2] it is probable that we have one element for which J was indebted to the priests. These tales naturally circulated at the

1. Carpenter and Harford, op. cit., p. 179.
2. Holzinger, op. cit., p. 137.

shrines of which they speak, and doubtless it was the priests of the shrines who were responsible for preserving them.

While, therefore, J is indebted in some measure to the priests, he does not seem to have been in sympathy with them as a group. In his individual opinions he shows closer affinity with certain aspects of prophetic thought. We may, however, take exception, as has been indicated above, to those who would associate him with the prophetic movement. Since he gives no evidence of contact with its greatest contribution we must look for the reason for his attitude to the cult in some other direction. Possibly this can be found as a result of his own personal genius. If, as we have tried to show in Chapters III and IV, the Urgeschichte, Gen. XIX 1-28, 30-38, XXXIV, and XXXVIII are typical of the tales which circulated at the sanctuaries under the supervision of some of the local priests, and if, of all such stories, J chose the choicest to present in his epic of the origins of Israel, it is understandable that the discriminating mind of our author should have been filled with disgust of the authorities who sanctioned such coarseness, and should have endeavored to present to his own readers a picture of Yahwistic religion free from all that savored of its influence. In so doing he was not associated with workers among the prophets. He was a discerning precursor of the prophets.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF J

In order to comprehend the social institutions of the J document it is necessary to recognize the fundamental fact that all of life in the time of J was an outgrowth of the primitive unit of society, the family. The family was the important entity in the nomadic period of which J desired to give a picture; but it also continued to furnish the foundation of the social system in the more complex life in Palestine during the time in which J was writing. The tribes were a natural outgrowth of the family -- a grouping of people all of whom were descendants of an earlier patriarch. That kinship was of the greatest importance is shown repeatedly in the stories of Abraham's servant in his search for a wife for Isaac (Gen. XXIV), and of Jacob's meeting with Laban and his sisters, and his desire to marry in Haran (Gen. XXIX). The gathering of related families in one locality to carry on their life is illustrated by the settlement of Jacob, and his sons, and his sons' sons, and his sheep, and his cattle, and all that he has in the land of Goshen (Gen. XLV 10). As Wallis has noted,[1] "The nation Israel was commonly referred to, in terms of kinship, as the 'children of Jacob-Israel,' or the 'family of Israel.'"

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 40.

CHAPTER VII

THE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF I

In order to comprehend the social institutions of the I community it is necessary to recognize the fundamental fact that all of life in this tribe of I is observed at the primitive unit of society, the family. The family was the important reality in the nomadic period of which I desired to give a picture; but in also considering the contrast formation of the social system in the more complex life in Palestine during the time in which I was writing. The tribes were a natural organization of the family -- a grouping of people all of whom were descendants of an ancestor patriarch. This kinship was of the greatest importance in shown especially in the chapter of Abimelech's sojourn in his search for a wife for Isaac (Gen. XXIV), and of Jacob's meeting with Laban and his sisters, and his desire to marry in Haran (Gen. XXIX). The patriarchs of related families in one locality to carry on their life is illustrated by the settlement of Isaac, and his sons, and his sons' sons. and his sheep, and his cattle, and all that he had in the land of Gerar (Gen. XXV 10). As Wallis has stated, "The nomadic Israel was commonly referred to, in terms of kinship, as the 'children of Jacob-Israel,' or the 'family of Israel.'"

1. Wallis, Sociological study of the Bible, p. 40.

This is true not only of J but of writers in much later times.

At the head of the family stood the father, the בעל or proprietor[1] of the establishment. All the interests of the household were centralized in his hands. He was the owner of his wife or wives, his children, slaves, flocks and herds, and material property. "The patriarchal family," as Soares has remarked,[2] "is evidently looked at in the light of a monarchical state. Some authority is necessary if society is to exist at all, and custom had naturally placed that authority in the hands of the father." It is sometimes questioned whether J knows of a time when the mother was the head of the family rather than the father. Thus Schaeffer says,[3] "Survivals of matriarchy are to be met with in some of the oldest portions of the Pentateuch. Wellhausen observes that the J document may be distinguished in many cases from the priestly code in that the former reckons descent through the mother; the latter, through the father. (Wellhausen, J. Die Ehe bei den Arabern, Götting. Gel. Nachrichten (1893), 478, note 2.)." This idea is strengthened by the observation that it is usually the mother in J

1. Ibid., p. 41.

2. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 40.

3. Schaeffer, The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites, p. 1.

who gives the name to the children;[1] and the choice of the name is no light matter among the Hebrews.[2] It is not believed that the selection is directed by chance. A name describes an actual characteristic of the person (Gen. XXV 25), or gives expression to a wish concerning his future (Gen. XXX 24). Sometimes the choice is directed by the deity himself (Gen. XVI 11). While, however, the stories with which J was familiar, and possibly some of the customs of his time, preserve elements which are survivals of a time when society was organized with the mother as the head of the family, it is obvious in J that by the time in which he was writing and for a long time earlier the father had been the head of the family in all of its interests.[3]

In this little state of which the father was the head the feeling of solidarity was very strong. All stood together for protection against enemies, and it was necessary that the good of the whole be consulted rather than the welfare of particular individuals. As a result the value of the individual was small, and his feelings and desires were little consulted. Whether it was his marriage, which was formed according to the best interests of the

1. Gen. XXIX, XXX; yet compare Ex. II 22 where Moses gives the name to his son.

2. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 135.

3. Soares, op. cit., p. 39.

the lives [illegible] men in the military[1]; and the people of one
more is no light matter among the Tarkana[2]. It is not
believed that the activities is directed by omens. A more
cynical view [illegible] characteristic of the person [illegible]
[illegible]), or pious conversion to a wise [illegible] life [illegible]
(see. [illegible]). Sometimes the choice is directed by our
[illegible] (see. [illegible]). [illegible], however, the choice
with which [illegible], the remaining [illegible]
of his time, preferred [illegible] the certainty of a
[illegible] marriage [illegible] with the [illegible]
of the family; it is [illegible] that by the time [illegible]
the [illegible] and for a long life [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible] family in all of [illegible].[3]

In this [illegible] or [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] the feeling of [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]
[illegible] for [illegible] [illegible], [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] the [illegible] of the [illegible] [illegible] rather than
the [illegible] of [illegible] individuals. [illegible]
[illegible] of [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

1. [illegible], [illegible]; [illegible] [illegible]. [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible].

2. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] in [illegible] [illegible].
[illegible] [illegible].

3. [illegible], op. cit., p. [illegible].

tribe, or the children whom he begot to increase its size and strength, all that he did was not for his own advantage, but for the welfare of the group as a whole. Both his physical and spiritual needs were completely subordinated to the interests, the security, and the survival of the tribe. Possibly, as Professor Cadbury has suggested,[1] it is from this element in the antecedents of Jewish life that there comes to expression the high ideals of sacrifice among these people. It can be "no accident of history that the world owes to the Jewish race so many expressions of the highest vicarious sacrifice-- from the prophetic picture of Moses praying to be blotted from the book of life for his people's sins (Ex. 32:32) to the patriot martyr of Calvary."

It is this central feature of ancient society, the importance of the family, that explains many of the other social relations which are characteristic of this time. Many of the marriage customs and the moral conceptions of the period are to be accounted for in this way. It will be necessary to bear this in mind in the discussion of the subject which follows.

In J marriages are arranged by business transactions, and there is no wedding ceremony.[2] A price is paid to the father for the bride, and the woman thenceforth becomes the

1. Cadbury, National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 16.
2. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 43.

property of the husband.[1] This purchase-price is called the מֹהַר. An illustration of such a procedure is found in Gen. XXIV. Here Abraham's servant gives to Rebekah herself "jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment;" and to her brother and mother he gives "precious things" (v. 53). If the man has insufficient property, sometimes service can be offered as a substitute for material remuneration. So Jacob acquired Rachel and Leah as his wives, according to the E story of Gen. XXIX, a story which must have had its parallel in J since the J material in Gen. XXX presupposes such a section. After the details of the business matter have been arranged, the bride is sent by her father to the bridegroom's house with a few woman servants as her own property (cf. Gen. XVI 2, XXIV 61). She becomes her husband's chattel, and his rights over her are as absolute as his rights over a slave. There are certain considerations, however, that tend to control his exercise of these rights.[2] His love for her is, of course, one influencing factor, but also the woman's influence, and the respect and fear for her family modify to some extent the arbitrariness of the husband's actions. Possibly it is the desire of the woman's

1. Smend, Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte, p. 143.

2. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 40.

property of the husband. This purchase-price is called the
[illegible]. An illustration of such a procedure is found in Gen.
XXIV. Here Abraham's servant gives to Rebekah kreadi
"jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment;" and
to her brother and mother he gives "precious things" (v. 53).
If the man has insufficient property, sometimes service can
be offered as a substitute for material remuneration. So
Jacob wooing Rachel and Leah at his wives, reducing to
the [illegible] story of Gen. XXIX, a story which must have had its
parallel in [illegible] the [illegible] material in Gen. XXX presupposes
such a practice. After the details of the business matter
have been arranged, the bride is sent by her father to the
bridegroom's house with a few more servants as her own
property (cf. Gen. XVI 2, XXIV 61). She becomes her husband's
chattel, and his rights over her are as absolute as his
rights over a slave. There are certain considerations,
however, that tend to control his exercise of these rights.
His love for her is, of course, one influencing factor, but
also the woman's influence, and the respect and fear for
her family modify to some extent the arbitrariness of the
husband's actions. Usually it is the desire of the woman's

1. Smend, Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte, p. 142.

2. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 40.

family to observe the treatment accorded her after marriage which is partially responsible for the preference (to be mentioned in the following paragraph) for marriages between kinsfolk, since they would generally result in the settlement of the new family close by.

The marriages were arranged by the fathers of the man and woman concerned. Thus Abraham had the right of choosing the bride for his son (Gen. XXIV). They were usually contracted between kinsfolk, because the purpose of the marriage was the production of children for the increase of the strength of the tribe. For this reason Abraham is determined that Isaac shall marry one of his own kindred rather than a Canaanitish woman (Gen. XXIV 3,37), and Jacob goes to his uncle's home in Haran and takes as his wives his cousins (Gen. XXIX). At times, however, marriage with foreign women is undertaken. Moses weds the daughter of the priest of Midian (Ex. II 21 f.); and the circumstances leading to this event are described with delight by the author of J.[1] There is, therefore, no religious feeling against intermarriage with foreigners, as at a later time, but the infrequency of such marriages is brought about, as has been said above, by the desire for tribal solidarity. In this same connection it may be

1. Smend, Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte, p. 146.

observed that marriages at this time are by no means love matches. They are arranged for the good of the tribe, and if love forms a part of the union it appears after the marriage has been consummated. Thus in Gen. XXIV 67 it is said that Isaac loved Rebekah, but it is to be noted that this comes after their marriage. That this is true of both J and E, Haller has shown.[1] "Gefühlsmotive," he says, "sind am Ende von c. 24 angedeutet, wo Rebekka den Isaaq über den Tod des Vaters tröstet (24^{67} J). Sonst ist die Eheschliessung trostlos nüchtern; praktische Rücksichten (29^{26} E 24^{14} J), die Eignung zur Zeltherrin, die Mitgift (31^{41} E) und der Mohar (24^{53} J) geben den Ausschlag."

Polygamy was recognized by J as quite suitable for the ancestors of his nation. Although Jacob had desired only Rachel he had no objections to taking both Rachel and Leah (Gen. XXIX). In fact there is no statement in the Old Testament to show disapproval of polygamous marriages. In all probability, however, even at the time of J, economic considerations and the harmony of the harem brought a pronounced tendency toward monogamy. As Soares has shown,[2] this is seen in the examples of Isaac, Joseph, and Moses, and "in the apology for Abraham on account of the childlessness of Sarah (Gen. 16.2)." Doubtless among the rulers of

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 98.

2. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 44.

J's day, as also in later times, it was the custom to have a large number of wives. This was, as Smend points out,[1] "ein barbarisches Insigne der Herrschaft, hatte übrigens auch politische Bedeutung, denn hier wie überall stiftete die Ehe Freundschaft." The mass of the people, however, found it advisable not to attempt to maintain a large establishment.

In the harem there could be not only one or more married wives, but it was also quite permissible for a man to have a number of women of subordinate position,, called concubines. These were sometimes drawn from slaves of the household. There was no stigma placed upon either the man for possessing concubines or upon the women as well. Children who were the offspring of such unions became members of the family, sharing equally with the sons and daughters of the regular wives. In this respect the children of Zilpah, according to Gen. XXX, should be noted. Also compare Sarai's hatred of Hagar when she realized that she was about to bear Abram a child who would have a claim to the inheritance as first-born (Gen. XVI).

Adultery was one of the worst possible crimes in the time of the Yahwistic author. There was no offence felt if a husband associated with another woman, but if a woman broke her marriage to associate with another man, or if a man attempted to entice some one's wife there was no punishment

1. Smend, op. cit., p. 144.

too great. When pharaoh, although unwittingly, took the wife of Abram (Gen. XII 10-20) he suffered severe plagues as a penalty; and Joseph was thrown into prison immediately because his master was convinced by his wife's tale that he was guilty of enticing her.

It follows from the fact that a wife is considered her husband's chattel that the position of woman at this time was rather low. This is borne out by Abram's treatment of Sarai in Gen. XII 10-20. Here Sarai's safety and honor are given little consideration. All that is of consequence is that Abram's life should be preserved. Similarly in Gen. XIX the welfare of Lot's guests is supremely important, and Lot is willing to sacrifice his two daughters if thereby the men of the city will agree to leave the strangers unharmed. The poor opinion held of women is shown also in Gen. XVIII, where, although in general the story is a delightful picture of the hospitable home of Abraham, Sarah shows in a less favorable light, for she readily lies to the divine visitants. On the other hand there are indications in J that a considerable degree of respect was paid to the women of the household. It has been observed before that it was often the mother who gave the names to the children (Gen. XXIX and XXX), even at a time when the name held a very important place in the thoughts of the people. It is also to be noticed that Rebekah was consulted by Laban to see

whether she was desirous of going with the man (Gen. XXIV 57, 58); and when she went she was accompanied by her own personal servants (Gen. XXIV 61). The woman, therefore, must have had a large sphere of influence in her home. She had her servants (Gen. XVI 1, XXX 10-13) and over them she exercised complete power. It was entirely Sarai's affair, Abram admitted, whether she was kind or harsh to her Egyptian slave (Gen. XVI 6). The delight, too, with which the author presents his picture of the beauty and graciousness of the mothers of Israel, Rebekah and Rachel, and of the loyalty of Sarai in preserving her husband's life (Gen. XII 10-20) bears witness to the fact that in that day the woman was associated with her husband in the people's affection for their parents. The general remark of Soares about the position of woman in the course of the history of the Jewish people appears to be suited to the situation of J's time:
"In spite of the subordinate legal position of a woman, the place of a mother was very high in Israel (Psa. 45.16 f.). Her name is always given in connection with the accession of her son as king. The mother stands with the father as the recipient of the pious honor of her children (Exod. 20.12; Lev. 19.3; Deut. 5.16)."[1]

Marriages were formed with the purpose of raising a large number of children that the strength of the family and

1. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 45.

tribe might be increased.[1] The greatest misfortune was to be childless. Thus Isaac grieved over Rebekah's barrenness and entreated Yahweh to give them children (Gen. XXV 21). Particularly distressing did it seem to the wife to be incapable of producing children, for her whole purpose in the home was gone if she bore her husband no offspring. In Gen. XVI Sarai grieves greatly at her own childlessness and takes means to give her husband children by offering her Egyptian maid Hagar. Again in Gen. XXX 14-16 Rachel purchases from Reuben some love apples that thereby she may be rid of the curse of barrenness.

Since it was the strength of the tribe that was at stake it was sons that were most desired.[2] To them always went the property at the father's death, or, if there were no sons, to some other male relative or adopted male heir. Usually the inheritance passed to the first-born. The right of the first-born was fought for by Jacob and Esau before their birth, and the struggle was continued afterwards in their boyhood (Gen. XXV). It was possible, however, for a younger son to obtain his older brother's right if he won his father's sanction, expressed in the form of a blessing. It was this that Jacob succeeded in doing in Gen. XXVII; and to Ephraim, Joseph's younger son, was the greater future

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, pp. 96, 98.

2. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 44.

[illegible]

promised in Jacob's blessing, although, according to the natural course of events, admittedly Manasseh would have been preferred to his brother (Gen. XLVIII). In spite of the importance that is thus attributed to the first-born it does not follow that the younger sons were necessarily considered inferior. On the contrary, the position which Joseph and Benjamin occupy in the narrative sufficiently proves that then as now the younger children were often the favorites of the family.[1]

The daughters occupy a very subordinate place in the family. They have by no means the same rights as their brothers,[2] and often are partially under their brothers' supervision. It is Laban who gives Rebekah, his sister, to Abraham's servant (Gen. XXIV). They are valuable to the family, however, for the work that they do about the home. Frequently the picture of women watering the flocks is found. Rachel brings her father's flock to the well where she is assisted in her task by Jacob (Gen. XXIX); and the daughters of the priest of Midian are watering the sheep when Moses meets them and offers his assistance (Ex. II 16). Because of this work the women of J's day have a certain amount of freedom. The daughters of the household who engage in such tasks move around openly at the well of the city and are by

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 141.

2. Ibid., p. 142.

no means secluded at home. It was at the well that Abraham's servant met Rebekah when he visited Haran to seek a wife for Isaac (Gen. XXIV); and the prayer that he offered to Yahweh on his arrival shows that he expected to meet free women, not slaves, engaged in the performance of such duties.[1] There are, then, as has been noted above, two sides to the picture of the woman's place in the home. One side shows a considerable amount of freedom, respect, and esteem offered to the woman; and the other shows a marked depreciation of her value. Evidence of the latter has already been offered in a preceding paragraph. Compare Lot's willingness to sacrifice his daughters (Gen. XIX), Abram's lack of chivalry to Sarai (Gen. XII 10-20), and Isaac's similar selfishness with regard to Rebekah (Gen. XXVI). Nevertheless the daughters were of importance to the household as a part of the father's wealth. Not only did they work for him, but when they married they brought a good price from the family of the bridegroom. This price varied widely with the differing conditions. Soares has stated well the theory underlying the practice and has explained on what the determination of the price rested.[2] "A man's children," he says, "were his wealth (Psa. 127.4). His sons remained with him and built up his house. His daughters, whose labor in the

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 142.

2. Soares, The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible, p. 41.

on shows conducted at home. It was at the well that Afrobeni's servant met Benoweh when he visited Ghana to take a wife for Isaac (Gen. XXIV); and the prayer that he offered to Yahweh on his arrival showed that he expected to meet free women, not slaves, indeed in the performance of some duties.[1] There are, then, as has been noted above, two sides to the picture of the woman's place in the home. One sides shows a considerable amount of freedom, respect, and esteem offered to the woman; and the other shows a marked depreciation of her value. Evidence of the latter has already been offered in a preceding paragraph. Lamech's willingness to sacrifice his daughters (Gen. XIX), Laban's lack of chivalry to Leah (Gen. XXI 16-20), and Jacob's similar selfishness with regard to Rebekah (Gen. XXVII). Nevertheless the Israelite made of importance to the household as a part of the Hebrew wealth. Not only did they work for him, but when (as) married (and) brought a good price from the family of the bridegroom. This price varied widely with particular conditions. Barnes has stated well the theory underlying the practice and has explained on what the determination of the price rested. "A woman's children,"[2] he says, "were his wealth (Gen. 127.4). His sons remained with him and built up his house. His daughters, whose labor in the

1. Mattes. op. cit., p. 14.

2. Barnes. The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible. p. 41.

household was valuable, were lost to him when they became married and thus entered other families, for the woman left her father's house and entered that of her father-in-law. The father, therefore, was indemnified for his loss by the payment of money. The value of a girl depended upon the dignity of the father, and upon her own beauty, while the matter was arranged as a bargain with which she had very little to do."

Slavery was one of the institutions at the basis of society in J's day. He accepted its presence as a matter of course, with no apparent knowledge of the fact that it had probably only in recent times become a part of the life of his people. Scholars are of the opinion that in nomadic life slavery was not practised; but only when a people settled down upon the land and acquired material goods which needed to be cared for did slavery come into existence. In support of this position Schaeffer says, "Slavery on a large scale presupposes a certain amount of material progress. Nomads are not in a position to create a surplus of economic goods owing to a scarcity of food and industrial pursuits. The institution of slavery could not have been a factor in Hebrew life until after the invasion of Canaan." [1] With the entrance into Canaan, however, and the acquisition of the land which needed working the use of slaves to perform the

1. Schaeffer, The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites, p. 86.

tasks was the natural means of solving the more intricate problems of a settled life.[1] J, therefore, was guilty of an anachronism when he placed slavery in the nomadic period of his people's history. It had become so much a part of the life of his time, however, that he could not have been aware of the real conditions, and he felt himself justified in attributing to the great men of the past those elements which in his day were characteristic of the most eminent members of the community-- among them the ownership of numerous slaves.

Slaves were considered personal property. In an enumeration of Abram's possessions, to show his great wealth, slaves are listed alongside cattle and sheep (Gen. XII 16).[2] Of this verse Gunkel remarks, "Die Aufzählung der Sklaven mitten zwischen den Tieren (auch 24^{35} 30^{43}) zeigt die antike Schätzung der Sklaven als eines Teils des Besitzes; hierin unterscheidet sich Israel von antiken Völkern auf ähnlicher Culturstufe eben nicht. -- Die Reihenfolge steigt wol von dem Billigen zu dem Wertvolleren auf; demnach wäre ein Sklave weniger wert gewesen als ein Esel oder Kameel (Holzinger)."

There were various ways in which slaves could be acquired. The story of the sale of Joseph into slavery

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 51 f.
2. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 156.

in Egypt (Gen. XXXVII 28, XXXIX 1) shows us one way with which J was familiar. Traveling traders, in this case Ishmaelites, picked up promising youths and maidens for sale in the countries where they carried on their business. For Joseph they paid twenty pieces of silver. Slaves were also sometimes won in war. According to the editor of Judges I, who probably took his information from J, many of the Canaanites were used for that purpose when the land was conquered from them (vv. 28,30,33,35). In the account of the deception of the Gibeonites (Jos. IX) the people of the city are made the slaves of the Hebrews. Other sections of the Old Testament (cf. Amos II 6, for example), although not J, show also that men were sometimes enslaved for failure to pay their debts.

The male slaves were considered a part of the family.[1] Therefore they participated in the family worship. Abraham's slave prayed to Yahweh in his attempt to fulfil satisfactorily his master's commission (Gen. XXIV 12). If they were not Israelites by birth they were forced to become Israelites by submitting to the rite of circumcision. So Moses aroused the anger of the deity (Ex. IV 24 ff.) because of his lack of circumcision when he attempted to enter a family which worshipped Yahweh without at the same time undergoing circumcision. Many slaves achieved positions

1. Schaeffer, The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites, p. 85 f.

In Egypt (Gen. XXXVII 36, XXXIX 1) shows us one way with which J was familiar. Travelling traders, in this case Ishmaelites, picked up promising youths and maidens for sale in the countries where they carried on their business. For Joseph they paid twenty pieces of silver. Slaves were also sometimes won in war. According to the editor of Judges I, who probably took his information from J, many of the Canaanites were used for that purpose when the land was conquered from them (vv. 28,30,33,35). In the account of the deception of the Gibeonites (Jos. IX) the people of the city are made the slaves of the Hebrews. Other sections of the Old Testament (cf. Amos II 6, for example), although not J, show also that men were sometimes enslaved for failure to pay their debts.

The male slaves were considered a part of the family.[1] Therefore they participated in the family worship. Abraham's slave prayed to Yahweh in his attempt to fulfill satisfactorily his master's commission (Gen. XXIV 12). If they were not Israelites by birth they were forced to become Israelites by submitting to the rite of circumcision. So Moses aroused the anger of the deity (Ex. IV 24 ff.) because of his lack of circumcision when he attempted to enter a family which worshipped Yahweh without at the same time undergoing circumcision. Many slaves enjoyed positions

1. Schaeffer, The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites, p. 45 f.

of great importance and responsibility in the household. When Abraham desired to arrange the marriage of Isaac he called "his eldest servant of his house, that ruled over all that he had" (Gen. XXIV 2); and when the servant left on his mission he "took ten camels of the camels of his master, and departed; for all the goods of his master were in his hand" (Gen. XXIV 10). Likewise Joseph's success in achieving so high a position in his master's house in Egypt (Gen. XXXIX) shows the opportunity which lay before good slaves. Wallis says of male slaves in the Old Testament in general, "In order to stimulate them to the most faithful service,[1] they were given commissions or a share in the profits; and they were thus able to acquire wealth of their own . .... Such men might buy their freedom, and set up independently of the ancient nobility if they wished, as provided for in Leviticus: 'If he become rich, he may redeem himself' (Lev. 25: 49). But the stress of war and the general insecurity were so great in the ancient Semitic world that the benefit of detachment from the old clanships appears to have been outweighed by its disadvantages. Accordingly, favorite slaves who became wealthy preferred to stand connected with some noble family of established position and influence."

There were female as well as male slaves. Some of

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 59.

these belonged to the man, and some to the wives of the household. Over these too they had absolute control since they were a part of their personal property. From his slaves often the man drew his concubines. The slaves of the wives of the household were not subservient to the husband, but were the personal property of the mistress. The mistress had absolute control over them. She could offer them to her husband as his concubines, but they did not stand in the same relation as the regular concubines of the family. Any children whom they bore the mistress considered her own. This is well illustrated by Sarai's arbitrary actions with Hagar (Gen. XVI) and by Leah's use of her maid Zilpah (Gen. XXX) to bear Gad and Asher, children who are accounted thenceforth to Leah.

Most of the service was performed by slaves; but occasionally free men offered themselves as hired workers. When Jacob was in Haran he maintained himself and his family by serving Laban for wages (Gen. XXX). The amount of the wages he set himself. Apparently the lot of such a man was far from pleasant and there was much oppression. Jacob says (Gen. XXXI 39) that he had to repay from his own property whatever loss came to the flock while it was under his care. No matter what the reason may have been for losses among the sheep, or under what circumstances they occurred, the burden had to be borne by him. There was little demand for hired workers since the amount of slave labor was

so large, and consequently the condition of free men who had reached a stage of poverty where they needed to rent themselves out in this way was very low. In fact, as Wallis has said,[1] many slaves preferred to remain attached to large families and thereby gain the protection and security offered to the family group rather than to detach themselves and join the ranks of the poor free men who were more exposed to exploitation than esteemed slaves.

In a consideration of the economic conditions in J it must be borne in mind that J was writing from the point of view of a man in the midst of a settled community idealizing the earlier days when his people were nomads. During the whole of Hebrew history the sturdy independence of the Israelites and their insistent demands for morality bore witness to the influence which the heritage of their nomadic life exerted upon these people. J fully appreciated this part of his inheritance and wrote with great charm his story of the early days of his nation. The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob wandered over the hills searching for favorable pasture land for their flocks, living a peaceful existence with no quarrels with their neighbors. Quarrels were definitely avoided; for example, Abram took measures to remove any occasion for disagreement with Lot about

1. Wallis, op. cit., p. 59.

so large, and consequently the condition of free men who had reached a stage of poverty where they needed to rent themselves out in this way was very low. In fact, as Mallie has said, many slaves preferred to remain attached to large families and thereby gain the protection and security offered to the family group rather than to detach themselves and join the ranks of the poor free men who were more exposed to exploitation than esteemed slaves.[1]

In a consideration of the economic conditions in J it must be borne in mind that J was writing from the point of view of a man in the midst of a settled community idealizing the earlier days when his people were nomads. During the whole of Hebrew history the sturdy independence of the Israelites and their insistent demands for morality bore witness to the influence which the heritage of their nomadic life exerted upon these people. J fully appreciated this part of his inheritance and wrote with great charm his story of the early days of his nation. The patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob wandered over the hills searching for favorable pasture land for their flocks, living a peaceful existence with no quarrels with their neighbors. Quarrels were definitely avoided; for example, Abram took measures to remove any occasion for disagreement with Lot about

1. Mallie, op. cit., p. 58.

pasturage by separating from him in a generous and friendly arrangement (Gen. XIII). The greatest problems which the people met were those arising from a desire for possession of wells. Water was invaluable in that dry country, and neighboring chieftains often disagreed about ownership of wells. No serious disputes arose in these matters, however, for in Gen. XXVI J showed that covenants were ratified between the tribal sheikhs to settle the arguments. The life was a peaceful, idyllic existence in which the only struggle was the matching of wit against wit to gain the advantages which every man wanted for himself and family. While this is the picture that J would give of the ancestors of the nation of Israel, it was written by him in a settled community in the southern part of the land of Canaan. Therefore it is natural that many of the conditions of his own day are found described therein. Whereas it is nomadic life that J intended to describe, institutions of an agricultural civilization can be discerned in the narrative. In Gen. XXX 14 Rachel bought the love apples from Reuben in the time of the wheat harvest. Walls says,[1] "the underlying social institutions of the Hexateuch are in agreement with those of the Judges-Samuel-Kings narratives."

Grazing is the predominating industry in J. When the wealth of the patriarchs is enumerated it consists largely in the men's herds. In Gen. XII 16 Abram is said to be wealthy because he has sheep, oxen, he asses, men-

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 44.

pastures by separating from him in a generous and friendly arrangement (Gen. XIII). The greatest problems which the people met were those arising from a desire for possession of wells. Water was invaluable in that dry country, and neighboring chieftains often disagreed about ownership of wells. No serious disputes arose in these matters, however, for in Gen. XXVI 1 showed that covenants were ratified between the tribal sheikhs to settle the arguments. The life was a peaceful, idyllic existence in which the only struggle was the matching of wit against wit to gain the advantages which every man wanted for himself and family. While this is the picture that I would give of the ancestors of the nation of Israel, it was written by him in a settled community in the southern part of the land of Canaan. Therefore it is natural that many of the conditions of his own day are found described therein. Hence it is reasonable that I intended to describe, institutions of an agricultural civilization can be discovered in the narrative. In Gen. XXX 14 Reuben brought the love apples from Reuben in the time of the wheat harvest. Wallis says, "the underlying social institutions of the Hexateuch are in agreement with those of the Judges-Samuel-Kings narratives."[1]

Grazing is the predominating industry in I. When the wealth of the patriarchs is enumerated it consists largely in the men's herds. In Gen. XII 16 Abram is said to be wealthy because he has sheep, oxen, he asses, men-

1. Wallis, Sociological Study of the Bible, p. 44.

servants, maidservants, she asses, and camels. In Gen. XIII 2 Abram has cattle, silver, and gold, and his nephew Lot, who also has large possessions, has flocks, herds, and tents (v. 5). When the servant of Abraham wishes to describe to Rebekah's family the wealth of their kinsman he says that he has flocks, herds, silver, gold, menservants, maidservants, camels, and asses. In Gen. XXVI 14 Isaac likewise is said to have had "possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants," so that "the Philistines envied him." When prosperity finally came to Jacob, we are told, "the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maidservants, and menservants, and camels, and asses" (Gen. XXX 43). Jacob himself lists his property in similar fashion when he sends a message to Esau which he hopes will impress him (Gen. XXXII 6). It is obvious, therefore, that the herds were the most important means of livelihood to the patriarchs, and probably also to the men of J's day. Agriculture was also a major industry. Mention of the wheat harvest appears in Gen. XXX 14, as has been said above. In Gen. XVIII 6 Sarah is directed to take three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth. In Gen. XXV 34 Jacob buys the birthright from his hungry brother Esau with a bowl of lentil soup. And in Gen. XXVII 25 we are told that he brought wine for his father to drink. All of these are products of the soil of the countryside where J was living.

servants, maidservants, she asses, and camels. In Gen. XIII 2 Abram has cattle, silver, and gold, and his nephew Lot, who also has large possessions, has flocks, herds, and tents (v. 5). When the servant of Abraham wished to describe to Rebekah's family the wealth of their master he says that he has flocks, herds, silver, gold, menservants, maidservants, camels, and asses. In Gen. XXVI 14 Isaac likewise is said to have had "possession of flocks, and possession of herds, and great store of servants," so that "the Philistines envied him." When prosperity finally came to Jacob, we are told, "the man increased exceedingly, and had much cattle, and maidservants, and menservants, and camels, and asses" (Gen. XXX 43). Jacob himself lists his property in similar fashion when he sends a message to Esau which he hopes will impress him (Gen. XXXII 5). It is obvious, therefore, that the herds were the most important means of livelihood to the patriarchs, and probably also to the man of J's day. Agriculture was also a major industry. Reaping of the wheat harvest appears in Gen. XXX 14, as has been said above. In Gen. XVIII 6 Sarah is directed to take three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth. In Gen. XXV 34 Jacob gets the birthright from his hungry brother Esau with a bowl of lentil soup. And in Gen. XXVII 25 we are told that he brought wine for his father to drink. All of these are products of the soil of the countryside where J was living.

That trading was carried on, J shows that he is well aware. Canaan was on the direct road between the northern and eastern countries and Egypt. Caravans followed various routes through the country bearing with them the merchandise which they hoped to sell at their destination. So Ishmaelites passed by while Joseph's brothers were considering what they would do with him. Their caravan was bearing spicery, balm, and myrrh; and when they saw the opportunity to purchase also a goodly youth for twenty pieces of silver they were happy to do so, for they knew well that he could easily be sold at a profit in Egypt (Gen. XXXVII, XXXIX). Not only are we told in this chapter that spices, balm, and myrrh, products of the east were available from traders passing through Canaan, but also in Gen. XLIII the gifts which Israel decided to send to Egypt were of this same nature, things which must have been procured from traveling merchants.

It is evident that there was considerable intercourse between the inhabitants of Palestine and those of Egypt. In time of famine the people seem to have been accustomed either to travel to Egypt where food was more plentiful, as Abram did according to Gen. XII 10-20, or to send messengers to that country in search of corn. So Jacob sent his sons to Egypt according to Gen. XLII and XLIII. There is much information about conditions

That trading was carried on, I above that he is well aware. Canaan was on the direct road between the northern and eastern countries and Egypt. Caravans followed various routes through the country bearing with them the merchandise which they hoped to sell at their destination. So Ishmaelites passed by while Joseph's brethren were considering what they would do with him. Their caravan was bearing spicery, balm, and myrrh; and when they saw the opportunity to purchase also a goodly profit for twenty pieces of silver they were happy to do so, for they knew well that he could easily be sold at a profit in Egypt (Gen. XXXVII, XXXIX). Not only are we told in this chapter that spices, balm, and myrrh, products of the east were available from traders passing through Canaan, but also in Gen. XLIII the gifts which Israel decided to send to Egypt were of this same nature, things which must have been procured from travelling merchants.

It is evident that there was considerable intercourse between the inhabitants of Palestine and those of Egypt. In time of famine the people seem to have been accustomed either to travel to Egypt where food was more plentiful, as Abram did according to Gen. XII 10-20, or to send messengers to that country in search of corn. So Jacob sent his sons to Egypt according to Gen. XLII and XLIII. There is much information about conditions

in Egypt shown by J which gives clear indication of the interest in the southern country felt by the people of his day.[1] Thus J is aware that the Egyptians have the right to thrust nomads across their borders (Gen. XII 20), while he does not consider that neighboring chieftains have the same right (cf. the story of Abimelech in Gen. XXVI 11). He knows of the despotic rule of the pharaohs and their associates (Gen. XLVII). He is familiar with the vegetables which are grown in that land (Nu. XI 5). He also tells that there is a prejudice among the Egyptians against eating with the Hebrews. This seems strange to him, a matter which needs careful statement (Gen. XLIII 32). At a later time the prejudice would more likely have been found on the part of the Hebrews themselves. It is evident, therefore, that in the period in which J was writing constant communication was carried on between the two countries, and there was a keen interest in Egyptian institutions.

In a consideration of the political institutions of the J document it is to be noticed that no reference is made in J to the existence of kings or rulers among the Israelites. Kings are recognized among the Philistines and Egyptians; but J is true to the conditions of nomadic life in omitting such rulers from among his people. The

1. Haller, Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen, p. 146.

in Egypt shown by J which gives clear indication of the interest in the southern country felt by the people of his day.[1] Thus J is aware that the Egyptians have the right to thrust nomads across their borders (Gen. XII 20), while he does not consider that neighboring sojourners have the same right (cf. the story of Abimelech in Gen. XXVI 1). He knows of the despotic rule of the pharaohs and their associates (Gen. XLVII). He is familiar with the vegetables which are grown in that land (Gen. XI 5). He also tells that there is a prejudice among the Egyptians against eating with the Hebrews. This seems strange to him, a matter which needs exactful statement (Gen. XLIII 32). At a later time the prejudice would more likely have been found on the part of the Hebrews themselves. It is evident, therefore, that in the period in which J was writing constant communication was carried on between the two countries, and there was a keen interest in Egyptian institutions.

In a consideration of the political institutions of the J document it is to be noticed that no reference is made in J to the existence of kings or rulers among the Israelites. Kings are recognized among the Philistines and Egyptians; but J is true to the conditions of nomadic life in omitting such rulers from among his people. The

1. Meiler, Religion, Recht und Sitte im den Genesisquellen, p. 142.

father of the family has control over the group in earliest times. Afterward Moses takes the directing position; and there follow him various tribal leaders, the sheikhs of the separate tribes which together constitute Israel.

While in general the relations between Israel and other nations are peaceful in the J narrative, enough critical situations arise to show the manner of dealing with such affairs in the time of J. Abimelech and Isaac disagree about the ownership of wells (Gen. XXVI). Some skirmishing ensues between the adherents of both men. The matter is finally settled by a compact between them. Again Laban pursues Jacob when he returns to Palestine, and overtakes him in Gilead. No struggle occurs, but the men form a covenant which is ratified by both (Gen. XXXI). Jacob fears the vengeance of Esau when he arrives in Palestine, but he sharpens his wits and succeeds in buying Esau's toleration of his presence in the land (Gen. XXXIII). The manner of ratifying a covenant between two contracting groups, which seems to have been so frequent in J's day, is well described in Gen. XXXI 46-52. Stones are set up to bear witness to the compact, and a meal is eaten by both groups at the spot (v. 46). Then a formal statement is made of the terms of the covenant (vv. 48,51,52).[1] According to Gen. XXVI 31 probably this is also accompanied by an oath calling upon the gods of both parties to insure

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 151.

father of the family has control over the group in earliest times. Afterward Judah takes the directing position; and there follow him various tribal leaders, the chiefs of the separate tribes which together constitute Israel.

While in general the relations between Israel and other nations are peaceful in the J narrative, enough critical situations arise to show the manner of dealing with such affairs in the time of J. Abimelech and Isaac disagree about the ownership of wells (Gen. XXVI). Some skirmishing ensues between the adherents of both men. The matter is finally settled by a compact between them. Again Laban pursues Jacob when he returns to Palestine, and overtakes him in Gilead. No struggle occurs, but the men form a covenant which is ratified by both (Gen. XXXI). Jacob fears the vengeance of Esau when he arrives in Palestine, but he sharpens his wits and succeeds in buying Esau's toleration of his presence in the land (Gen. XXXIII). The manner of ratifying a covenant between two contracting groups, which seems to have been so frequent in J's day, is well described in Gen. XXXI 46-54. Stones are set up to bear witness to the compact, and a meal is eaten by both groups at the spot (v. 46). Then a formal statement is made of the terms of the covenant (vv. 49,51,52).[1] According to Gen. XXVI 31 probably this is also accompanied by an oath calling upon the gods of both parties to ignore

1. Baiter, op. cit., p. 151.

fidelity to the contract.

Law and the administration of justice were still in a very undeveloped form. Laws were determined by the custom of the group rather than by any reasoned formulation of rules. Jacob objected to Laban's deception in substituting Leah for Rachel, his promised bride, and was told, "It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the firstborn" (Gen. XXIX 26). Because the people were not accustomed to the marriage of the younger daughters before their older sisters Laban could justify himself for his act. Since the administration of justice was in the hands of the family there was no protection for the foreigner in the community. The story of Lot and the visitors whom he entertained (Gen. XIX) is evidence of the defenceless position of a resident alien. Since the family was the source from which vengeance against an aggressor proceeded a man separated from his family was in a vulnerable position. It was for this reason that the prophetic writers of later times had much to say about the stranger, the widow, and the orphan.[1] Respect for property rights was not very strong. When the brothers of Joseph were caught with stolen property in their possession they felt it a great misfortune, but no disgrace (Gen. XLIV 13).

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 149.

liability to the contract.

Law and the administration of justice were still in a very undeveloped form. Laws were determined by the custom of the group rather than by any reasoned formulation of rules. Jess objected to Isaac's deception in substituting Leah for Rachel, his promised bride, and was told, "It must not be so done in our country, to give the younger before the firstborn" (Gen. XXIX 26). Because the people were not accustomed to the marriage of the younger daughters before their older sisters Laban could justify himself for his act. Since the administration of justice was in the hands of the family there was no protection for the foreigner in the community. The story of Lot and the visitors from Sodom (Gen. XIX) is evidence of the defenseless position of a resident alien. Since the family was the source from which vengeance against an aggressor proceeded a man separated from his family was in a vulnerable position. It was for this reason that the prophetic writers of later times had much to say about the stranger, the widow, and the orphan. Respect for property rights was not very strong. When the prophets of Israel were concerned with stolen property it was poverty and not illegal misfortune, but no redress (Gen. XLIV 13).

1. Mallam, op. cit., p. 119.

Jacob was greatly admired by the Israelites for his cleverness in outwitting Esau and appropriating the right of the first-born which lawfully belonged to his brother (Gen. XXVII). When a theft occurred, punishment for the act rested upon the man or the family of the man from whom the property was stolen. The procedure in such a case is illustrated by Joseph's treatment of his brothers when they come to him in Egypt (Gen. XLIV). The injured party makes his accusation; the accused offers a high penalty, to be imposed if the crime can be proved against him; and a search for the property is conducted by the injured. The punishment which is finally decided upon is left to the decision of the injured when the guilt is established. In regard to this matter Haller says,[1] "Die Strafe des Diebstahls besteht in der Rache des Bestohlenen. Das Strafrecht steht somit unter dem Begriff der Rache. Sie erscheint als das natürliche Rechtsmittel, das der Geschädigte ergreift. .... An Stelle der Rache tritt aber sehr früh die Talion, dann der Ersatz in Geld und Gut, der die Rache aufhebt..... Jaqob zeigt grosse Angst vor der Rache Esaus (32^8 J), versucht aber doch einen Loskauf."

The ethics of J are determined by custom and national need and are not a part of religion. The family

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 149 f.

Jacob was greatly admired by the Israelites for his cleverness in outwitting Esau and appropriating the right of the first-born which lawfully belonged to his brother (Gen. XXVII). When a theft occurred, punishment for the act rested upon the man or the family of the man from whom the property was stolen. The procedure in such a case is illustrated by Joseph's treatment of his brothers when they come to him in Egypt (Gen. XLIV). The injured party makes his accusation; the accused offers a high penalty, to be imposed if the crime can be proved against him; and a search for the property is conducted by the injured. The punishment which is finally decided upon is left to the decision of the injured when the guilt is established. In regard to this author Haller says, "Die Strafe des Diebstahls besteht in der Rache des Bestohlenen. Das Strafrecht steht somit unter der Herrschaft der Rache. Die erschlichene als die mutwillige Beschämung, wer der Verschuldete erreicht. .... An Stelle der Rache tritt später erst die Sühne, dann der Ersatz in Geld dann Gut, der die Rache mindert..... Jacob zeigt grosse Angst vor der Rache Esaus (32g 7), versucht eben doch einen Loserkauf."

The ethics of 1 are determined by custom and national need and are not a part of religion. The family

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 149 f.

or national group is the element in the center of attention, and actions are regulated for the well-being of that entity. Only in so far as the aim of the deity is also the welfare of the tribe and any crime against the tribe is an injury to the tribal god does any connection between the two arise. In this way a certain interaction between ethics and religion results; but ethics are not yet under the protection of a moral god. J shows none of the ideas in this direction which are found in the work of his successors Amos and Hosea. Since the Egyptians were foreigners Abram's treatment of the Egyptian pharaoh (Gen. XII 10-20) in exposing him to punishment for the crime of taking a man's wife is justifiable in J's eyes.[1] And Jacob's dealings with Esau are warranted in view of the perennial enmity between Edom and Israel.

Two groups of ethical characteristics can be distinguished in J. On the one side J's heroes show qualities which, from the point of view of the present day, seem lacking in some of the essentials of morality. On the other hand they present in a very appealing way the noble features which the society of J's day recognized as essential to gentlemen. In the first group of characteristics may be noticed the attitude to foreigners. The ability to outwit foreigners by lies and deception was a sign of competence and great cleverness in a man. Foreigners were not members

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 101 f.

or national group is the element in the center of attention. and actions are regulated for the well-being of that entity. Only in so far as the aim of the deity is also the welfare of the tribe and any crime against the tribe is an injury to the tribal god does any connection between the two arise. In this way a certain interaction between ethics and religion results; but ethics are not yet under the protection of a moral god. J shows some of the ideas in this direction which are found in the work of his successors Amos and Hosea. Since the Egyptians were foreigners Abram's treatment of the Egyptian pharaoh (Gen. XII 10-20) in exposing him to punishment for the crime of taking a man's wife is justifiable in J's eyes.[1] And Jacob's dealings with Esau are warranted in view of the perennial enmity between Edom and Israel.

Two groups of ethical characteristics can be distinguished in J. On the one side J's heroes show qualities which, from the point of view of the present day, seem lacking in some of the essentials of morality. On the other hand they present in a very appealing way the noble features which the society of J's day recognized as essential to gentlemen. In the first group of characteristics one may be noticed the attitude to foreigners. The ability to outwit foreigners by lies and deception was a sign of competence and great cleverness in a man. Foreigners were not members

1. Meiler, op. cit., p. 101.1.

of the tribe, and anything which was to their disadvantage probably strengthened the tribal unit. This explanation accounts for Abram's actions in lying to pharaoh to preserve his life (Gen. XII 10-20), and similarly for Isaac's behavior in telling Abimelech that Rebekah was his sister (Gen. XXVI). It also shows why no offense was felt when Yahweh suggested that permission be sought to make a three days' journey into the wilderness to worship him (Ex. III 18*). Moses knew, and the readers of J's time knew that the actual purpose of their departure was different, and there would be no return. Such deception of an Egyptian on the part of the deity or Moses was justifiable, however, since it furthered the interests of the tribe against an enemy. Not only in the case of foreigners, however, who always called forth few of the marks of consideration which would ordinarily be paid to a brother Israelite, but also in their dealings with their own kinsmen lying and deceit were not deprecated. In fact Haller says of these qualities,[1] "Die gänzliche Verpönung der Lüge ist ein Produkt der spätern, feiner, aber oft schwächer empfindenden Zeit, die Recht und Pflicht über die Stammesgrenzen hinaus kannte. Dass Lug und Trug im engsten Familienkreis denkbar und sogar wahrscheinlich ist, wird aus der Jaqub-Esaugeschichte (c. 27 JE) klar." In fact the only element of the Abram and Isaac stories

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 117.

of the tribe, was anything which was to their advantage probably strengthened the tribal unit. This explanation accounts for Abram's actions in lying to pharaoh to preserve his life (Gen. XII 10-20), and similarly for Isaac's behavior in telling Abimelech that Rebekah was his sister (Gen. XXVI). It also shows why no offense was felt when Jacob suggested that permission be sought to make a three days' journey into the wilderness to worship him (Ex. III 18[1]). Moses knew, and the leaders of his time knew that the actual purpose of their departure was different, and there would be no return. Such deception of an Egyptian on the part of the deity or Moses was justifiable, however, since it furthered the interests of the tribe against an enemy. But only in the case of foreigners, however, who always called forth fear of the margin of consideration which would ordinarily be paid to a brother Israelite, but also in their dealings with their own kinsmen lying and deceit were not deprecated. In fact the later days of these qualities. "Die ethnische Verdammung der Lüge ist ein Produkt der spätern, feinern, über oft schwächer ausfindenen Zeit, die doch was Gutes über die Stammesgenossen hinaus kannte. Dass Lug und Trug in engsten Familienkreis daucht und sogar wunderbarlich ist, wird aus der Jacob-Esausgeschichte (c. 27 32) klar." In fact the only element of the Abram and Isaac stories

1. Muller, op. cit., p. 117.

of Gen. XII and XXVI which would seem offensive if practised with a brother Israelite was the breaking of marriage therein involved.[1] Putting a kinsman in the position of pharaoh or Abimelech would seem reprehensible to J, but as far as lying was concerned, that would be a mark of the hero's cleverness. Selfishness and cowardice are also revealed in the characters. Abram was so anxious for his own safety that he exposed his wife to danger when he permitted pharaoh to take her thinking she was his sister (Gen. XII 10-20). Lot willingly offered his daughters to the violent men of Sodom to preserve himself and his guests from their onslaught (Gen. XIX). Isaac, as earlier Abram, sacrificed his wife's honor (Gen. XXVI) to keep himself from harm. And when Jacob met Esau he placed Leah and her children first, then Rachel, and finally himself, in the hope that Esau would not damage the whole family, and kill them all including himself (Gen. XXXIII). An unfeeling cruelty is likewise to be observed in Jacob's willingness to take advantage of his aged father's blindness to deceive him and win the blessing he had intended for another (Gen. XXVII). When Joseph acquired all the property and even the individuals themselves throughout the land of Egypt as the possession of the pharaoh

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 113.

of Gen. XII and XXVI which would seem offensive if presented with a brother Isaac's wife was the breaking of marriage taboos involved.[1] Putting a Canaanite in the position of pharaoh or Abimelech would seem reasonably to J, but as far as lying was concerned, that would go a long ways to prove's innocence. Antipathy and something else applied in the counterpart. Abram was so anxious for his own safety that he exposed his wife to danger when he promised pharaoh to take her saying she was his sister (Gen. XII 10-20). Yet willingly offered his daughters to the violent men of Sodom to preserve himself and his guests from their ravaging (Gen. XIX). Isaac, or earlier scribe, sacrificed his wife's honor (Gen. XXVI) to keep himself free harm. And when Leah met same or similar Esau and her children first, then Rachel, and finally himself. In the hope that Esau would not damage the whole family, and kill them all including himself (Gen. XXXII). In assessing cruelty it likewise to be observed in Jacob's willingness to take advantage of his aged father's blindness to deceive him and win the blessing to use intended for another (Gen. XXVII). When Joseph acquired all the property and even the individuals subsequently throughout the land of Egypt as the consequence of the famine

1. Ballmer, op. cit., p. 116.

whose interests he served (Gen. XLVII), his ability and cleverness were much admired. The oppression of the people and their sufferings were entirely unperceived by J and his readers.

When J is compared with the Iliad or the Nibelungenlied, however, the value of human life found[1.] therein is much greater than that in the epics of these other peoples. The picture of the early days of J's nation exalts the peaceful existence of the patriarchs and their harmonious associations with their neighbors. Warfare and chivalry are not glorified, but instead the gentlemanly traits which appear in an ordered family life wherein all of the kinsmen prosper. So Abram gives Lot his choice of fertile pasture land that thereby trouble between uncle and nephew may be avoided (Gen. XIII); and Jacob uses his wits to gain his ends with Esau and Laban (Gen. XXV, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII) rather than have any open trouble with them. Respect for a person's elders is a prominent ethical[2.] quality insisted upon throughout Hebrew literature, and revealed clearly in the writings of J. The desire of Judah to save his father distress (Gen. XLIV) is told with sympathy which is very affecting. Rather would he suffer

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 107.

2. Smend, Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte, p. 145.

whose interests he served (Gen. XXVII), his ability and cleverness were much admired. The oppression of the people and their sufferings were actively unperceived by J and his readers.

When J is compared with the Iliad or the Nibelungenlied, however, the value of human life found therein is much greater than that in the epics of these other peoples. The picture of the early days of J's nation exalts the peaceful existence of the patriarchs and their harmonious associations with their neighbors. Warfare and chivalry are not glorified, but instead the gentlemanly traits which appear in an ordered family life wherein all of the kinsmen prosper. So Abram gives Lot his choice of fertile pasture land that thereby trouble between uncle and nephew may be avoided (Gen. XIII); and Jacob woos his wife to gain his ends with Rachel and Leban (Gen. XXV, XXVII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIII) rather than have any open trouble with them. Respect for a person's elders is a prominent ethical quality insisted upon throughout Hebrew literature, and revealed clearly in the writings of J. The desire of Judah to save his father distress (Gen. XLIV) is told with sympathy which is very attractive. Nature would in another

1. Haller, op. cit., p. 107.
2. Simrod, Im Wunder der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte, p. 115.

imprisonment himself than have the youngest brother, his father's darling, undergo such an experience and so occasion his father's death. Hospitality is a virtue inherent in any Israelitish gentleman. Abraham[1] runs with alacrity to greet the strangers who approach his tent. He offers them rest, water to wash their feet, and a bounteous meal served to them by the host himself. All of this is done before he inquires their names (Gen. XVIII). Lot is equally courteous when strangers come to the city of Sodom (Gen. XIX). Rebekah and Rachel carry out the Israelitish ideal of hospitality when the opportunity comes to them to offer entertainment to strangers (Gen. XXIV, XXIX). And on the occasion when the daughters of the priest of Midian fail to return the courtesy which Moses rendered them they are quickly reproved by their father (Ex. II 16-22). Generosity and warm-heartedness were likewise characteristics which drew J's fervent admiration. In a very subtle way J praises the generosity of Abram in his dealings with Lot (Gen. XIII). The charm with which his courtesy and magnanimity are unfolded, bringing their due reward in the course of time, reveals the true fineness of the author of the epic, who himself must have been in the forefront of the gentlemen of his nation. Likewise[2] Judah's care for Benjamin and Joseph's generous

1. Smend, op. cit., p. 148, and Bertholet, A History of Hebrew Civilization, p. 186.

2, Smend, op. cit., p. 145.

imprisonment himself than have the youngest brother, his father's darling, undergo such an experience and so occasion his father's death. Hospitality is a virtue inherent in any Israelitish household.[1] Abraham runs with alacrity to greet the strangers who approach his tent. He offers them rest, water to wash their feet, and a bountiful meal served to them by the most himself. All of this is done before he inquires their name (Gen. XVIII). Lot is equally courteous when strangers come to the city of Sodom (Gen. XIX). Rebekah and Rachel carry out the Israelitish ideal of hospitality when the opportunity comes to them to offer entertainment to strangers (Gen. XXIV, XXIX). And on the occasion when the daughters of the priest of Midian fail to return the courtesy which Moses rendered them they are quickly reproved by their father (Ex. II 18-22). Generosity and warm-heartedness were likewise characteristics which grew its fervent sanctation. In a very subtle way I trace the generosity of Abram in his dealings with Lot (Gen. XIII). The course with which his courtesy and generosity are matured, bringing their due reward in the course of time, reveals the true tenderness of the author of the epic, who himself must have been in the forefront of the gentlemen of his nation. Likewise Judah's care for Benjamin and Joseph's generous

1. Smend, op. cit., p. 149, and Bertholet, A History of Hebrew Civilization, p. 126.

2. Smend, op. cit., p. 148.

reconciliation with his brothers (Gen. XLII-XLV) are developed with all the skill that an appreciative writer can employ. Disaffection in family circles doubtless existed in J's day, and such conditions, J admits at times, were found among the patriarchs. These unpleasant relations, however, J found intolerable, and passing them lightly he dwells with color and vigor on such scenes as show the warmth of family affection among his people.

Both ignoble and noble ethical qualities, then, as has just been shown, can be found existent in the J document. The ignoble qualities, however, are probably to be accounted for by the undeveloped sensibilities of the early day in which the epic was written. The wonder of the work of the Yahwist is that so fine an ethical sense should have been attained in a period as brief as that in which the nation had been in existence. The experience of nomadic life which emphasized family solidarity and the cooperation of all members for mutual welfare seems to have furnished an environment favorable to moral development. As a result of this background the Israelitish nation continually produced men who were pioneers in ethical thinking. Among these pioneers J stood, in the forefront of the people of his age.

representation with his brothers (Gen. XXII-XLV) are
developed with all the skill that an appreciative writer
can employ. Disaffection in family circles sometimes
existed in J's day, and such conditions, J admits at
times, were found among the patriarchs. These unpleasant
relations, however, J found intolerable, and painting them
lightly he dwells with color and vigor on more agreeable
show the warmth of family affection among his people.

Both ignoble and noble ethical qualities, then, as
has just been shown, can be found existent in the J document.
The ignoble qualities, however, are probably to be accounted
for by the undeveloped sensibilities of the early age in
which the epic was written. The wonder of the work of the
Jahwist is that so fine an ethical sense should have been
attained in a period so brief as that in which the nation
had been in existence. The experience of nomadic life
which emphasized family solidarity and the cooperation of
all members for mutual welfare seems to have furnished an
environment favorable to moral development. As a result
of this background the Israelitish nation continually
produced men who were pioneers in ethical thinking. Among
these pioneers J stood, in the forefront of the people of
his age.

CHAPTER VIII

NATIONALISM

One of J's outstanding characteristics is his ardent nationalism. The pride in Israel, its promising origin, and its steady development under Yahweh's constant direction is evident from the opening verses of the epic. Particularly noteworthy is this element in J in comparison with other peoples of antiquity. It may be found in Greece in the Age of Pericles and later in the republic and empire of Rome. In the time of J and for long after, however, it is not found outside the Hebrew people. The Canaanites had no such feeling of patriotism. The Assyrians wrote annals of events of importance to the empire. Among both Assyrians and Greeks myths and accounts of the adventures of national heroes were elaborated. Nowhere, however, were the pride in the past and present and the high hopes for the future of the nation so consciously held as among the Hebrews. The responsibility for this patriotism among them was in large measure, it seems probable, owing to J.

The period in which J lived in part accounts for the patriotic fervor which he succeeded in passing on to subsequent generations. As has been said in the chapter on social institutions, because of the nomadic background of the Israelitic people the emphasis in J's day was on

CHAPTER VIII

NATIONALISM

One of J's outstanding characteristics is his ardent nationality. The pride in Israel, its promising origin, and its steady development under Yahweh's constant direction is evident from the opening verses of the epic. Particularly noteworthy is this element in J in comparison with other peoples of antiquity. It may be found in Greece in the Age of Heroides and later in the republic and empire of Rome. In the time of J and for long after, however, it is not found outside the Hebrew people. The Canaanites had no such feeling of patriotism. The Assyrians wrote annals of events of importance to the empire. Among both Assyrians and Greeks myths and accounts of the adventures of national heroes were elaborated. Nowhere, however, were the pride in the past and present and the high hopes for the future of the nation so conspicuously held as among the Hebrews. The responsibility for this patriotism among them was in large measure, it seems probable, owing to J.

The period in which J lived is part accounts for the patriotic fervor which he succeeded in passing on to subsequent generations. As has been said in the chapter on social institutions, because of the nomadic background of the Israelitic people the emphasis in J's day was on

the welfare of the social group rather than on the needs of the individual. The family, widened to take in the tribe, and expanded still more to embrace the nation, demanded the sacrificial loyalty of each of its members. Zeal for its prowess and its achievements was dominant in every Israelite. Furthermore, the recent[1] success of the Israelitish tribes in establishing themselves in the land of Canaan, in overpowering the Canaanitish inhabitants, whether by war, trickery, or peaceful amalgamation, and in setting up the first monarchy in the land raised the self-esteem of the Israelites to a very high level. Solomon, in his magnificent court and ambitious building enterprises attempted to rival with his kingdom the more extensive empires of the then-known world. The splendor of his reign, furnishing a stimulus for culture of all sorts, as later happened in the renaissance in England in the time of Queen Elizabeth, would furnish a very suitable background for the author of J. The less prosperous, but still fairly peaceful reign of Jehoshaphat in the ninth century, however, may have been the time of his work,[2] for the memory of the glorious days preceding was retained in the southern kingdom at this time. These characteristics of the period in which J lived, however, do not sufficiently account for his ardent patriotism. Much is to be attributed

1. Cf. Bertholet, Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, p. 80.

2. Cf. Chapter I.

the welfare of the social group rather than on the needs of the individual. The family, widened to take in the tribe, and expanded still more to embrace the nation, demanded the sacrificial loyalty of each of its members. Zeal for its prowess and its achievements was dominant in every Israelite.[1] Furthermore, the recent success of the Israelitish tribes in establishing themselves in the land of Canaan, in overpowering the Canaanitish inhabitants, whether by war, trickery, or peaceful amalgamation, and in setting up the first monarchy in the land raised the self-esteem of the Israelites to a very high level. Solomon, in his magnificent court and ambitious building enterprises attempted to rival with his kingdom the more extensive empires of the then-known world. The splendor of his reign, furnishing a stimulus for culture of all sorts, as later happened in the renaissance in England in the time of Queen Elizabeth, would furnish a very suitable background for the author of J. The less prosperous, but still fairly powerful reign of Jehoshaphat in the ninth century, however, may have been the time of his work.[2] For the enemy of the glorious days preceding was rotting in the southern kingdom at this time. These characteristics of the period in which J lived, however, do not sufficiently account for his great patriotism. Much is to be attributed

1. Cf. Gerhardt, Die Stellung der Israelitin und der Jude im den Frauen, p. 80.

2. Cf. Chapter I.

to his own genius. His interpretation of the significance of the nation in terms of the constant purpose of their god for them was the unique contribution of this Hebrew epic writer. His successful presentation of the idealistic story of his people kindled the spark of patriotism which grew with succeeding generations of Israelites.

J's nationalism is manifested in various ways throughout the course of his epic. He traces the glorious history of Israel from its very beginning in the time of Abraham, through vicissitudes of prosperity and adversity to the establishment in the land of Canaan. In the opening verses his theme is presented (Gen. XII 1-3), the development of the people, under Yahweh's guidance, from a small unit to the world-influencing nation in possession of the land of Canaan. To Abram is made the promise for the future before he has left his home in Haran. He is reassured by the deity (Gen. XIII 14-17) when he has entered the land and Lot has selfishly appropriated the most desirable sections; and the author recalls this promise to the minds of his readers in a brief allusion in Gen. XXIV 7. When the second cycle of patriarchal narratives is begun the promise is repeated to Abraham's son (Gen. XXVI 3a, 24). Even the neighboring peoples sense the propitious influences guiding this family, since the hostile Abimelech requests a covenant with Isaac (v. 28).

to his own genius. His interpretation of the significance of the nation in terms of the constant purpose of their god for them was the unique contribution of this Hebrew epic writer. His successful presentation of the idealistic story of his people kindled the spark of patriotism which grew with succeeding generations of Israelites.

J's nationalism is manifested in various ways throughout the course of his epic. He traces the glorious history of Israel from its very beginning in the time of Abraham, through vicissitudes of prosperity and adversity to the establishment in the land of Canaan. In the opening verses his theme is presented (Gen. XII 1-3), the development of the people, under Yahweh's guidance, from a small unit to the world-influencing nation in possession of the land of Canaan. To Abram is made the promise for the future before he has left his home in Haran. He is reassured by the deity (Gen. XIII 14-17) when he has entered the land and Lot has selfishly appropriated the most desirable sections; and the author recalls this promise to the minds of his readers in a brief allusion in Gen. XXIV 7. When the second cycle of patriotical narrative is begun the promise is repeated to Abraham's son (Gen. XXVI 3a, 4). Even the neighboring peoples sense the propitious influences guiding this family, since the hostile Abimelech requests a covenant with Isaac (v. 28).

Isaac passes on the promise which he had received to Jacob in his paternal blessing (Gen. XXVII 29aαβb, 33). And the constant sense of the divine guidance is felt once more when Jacob is forced to flee from his home to a foreign land; as he departs (Gen. XXVIII 13-16), the deity in person assures him that as his father's son the promise is continued through him. By these specific and recurring statements in the early part of the epic the underlying theme is fixed in the minds of the readers. Through the experiences of Joseph, Moses, and the tribes attempting the conquest of Canaan the results of these early promises are disclosed. As the author writes he directs the readers to look far ahead to the glowing future which is assured.

In his presentation of the glorious history of his own people J makes disparaging remarks about the neighboring peoples of his day. For Edom, in particular, he has no regard since Judah had so many hostile encounters with the nation on its southern border. According to Gen. XXV 21-34 Esau was an improvident hunter, while Jacob lived a half nomadic life which was J's ideal. The Arameans were the people from whom Laban came, and his trickery cheated Jacob and forced on him a wife whom he hated (Gen. XXIX). The Canaanites too were despised by J, and he pictured Abraham with great earnestness insisting that no marriage should be

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 361.

Isaac passes on the promise which he had received to Jacob in his paternal blessing (Gen. XXVII 29a,b, 33). And the constant sense of the divine guidance is felt once more when Jacob is forced to flee from his home to a foreign land; as he departs (Gen. XXVIII 13-15), the deity in person assures him that as his fathers' son the promise is continued through him. By these specific and recurring statements in the early part of the epic the unifying theme is fixed in the minds of the readers. Through the experiences of Joseph, Moses, and the tribes attempting the conquest of Canaan the results of these early promises are disclosed. As the author writes he directs the readers to look far ahead to the glorious future which is assured.

In his presentation of the glorious history of his own people J makes disparaging remarks about the neighboring peoples of his day. For Edom, in particular, he has no regard since Judah has so many hostile encounters with the nation on its southern border. According to Gen. XXV 21-34 Esau was an improvident hunter, while Jacob lived a half nomadic life which was J's ideal. The Aramaeans were the people from whom Jacob came, and his trickery shamed Laban and forced on him a wife whom he hated (Gen. XXIX). The Ammonites too were despised by J. and he pictured Lot-Ben with great scorneness insisting that no marriage should be

1. Skinner, Genesis, p. 331.

arranged for Isaac from among their women (Gen. XXIV 3, 37).

While he distrusted the Arameans, however, J had wide respect for them as one of the most influential nations of antiquity. It was probably his desire for the prestige of being related to so great a people that caused him to emphasize Haran as the original home of his people. From there proceeded Abraham, and later on Rebekah, Leah, and Rachel (cf. Gen. XXIV and XXIX).

J's unmitigated nationalism is shown in his descriptions of Yahweh's partiality for Israelites. In Gen. XII 10-20 Abram is protected and pharaoh injured when the blame rests with the patriarch. In the similar incident in Gen. XXVI Isaac is prospered to the disadvantage of Abimelech, although he had put the latter in a dangerous situation. Abimelech recognizes the partiality of Yahweh for him and the power which Yahweh has to accomplish his purpose; and he therefore hastens to arrange a covenant of friendship between the two groups (v. 28). When Jacob is serving Laban Yahweh reduces the wealth of Laban markedly, and at the same time prospers Jacob (Gen. XXX). According to the story of Gen. XXXIX, so long as Joseph is overseer of his master's house great prosperity favors the Egyptian because "Yahweh blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake" (v. 5). Throughout the Egyptian troubles of the people Yahweh takes their part and afflicts the

arranged for Isaac from among their women (Gen. XXIV 3, 37).

While he distributed his presents, however, I had wide respect for them as one of the most influential nations of antiquity. It was probably his desire for the prestige of being related to so great a people that caused him to emphasize Haran as the original home of his people. From there proceeded Abraham, who later on Mahalaw, Leah, and Rachel (cf. Gen. XXIV and XXIX).

I'm unmitigated nationalism is shown in his descriptions of Yahweh's partiality for Israelites. In Gen. XII 10-20 Abram is protected and pharaoh injured when the plague reels with the patriarch. In the similar incident in Gen. XXVI Isaac is preferred to the disadvantage of Abimelech, although he had put the latter in a dangerous situation. Abimelech recognizes the partiality of Yahweh for him and the power which Yahweh has to accomplish his purpose; and he therefore hastens to arrange a covenant of friendship between the two groups (v. 28). Then Jacob is serving Laban Yahweh reduces the wealth of Laban suddenly, and at the same time prepares Jacob (Gen. XXX). According to the story of Gen. XXXIX, as long as Joseph is overseer of his master's house great prosperity favors the Egyptian because "Yahweh blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake" (v. 5). Throughout the Egyptian troubles of the people Yahweh takes their part and afflicts the

Egyptians. He urges that deception be practised to secure their departure from the country (Ex. III 18*). He sends plagues on Egypt but spares the land of Goshen (Ex. VIII 22, IX 6, 26, XI 7). There is in all of J no gleam of the spirit of universalism of the later prophets, although the opposite statement is sometimes made. Gen. XII 3, XXVI 4b, and XXVIII 14 are occasionally quoted as evidence of a desire on the part of J to make of his people a missionary nation, as later Second Isaiah taught with vigor. In a discussion of these verses Bertholet has pointed out[1] that the Niph'al and Hithpa'el of the verbs therein contained should be taken in a reflexive sense. Gen. XII 3b would then be translated: "and by thee shall all the families of the earth <u>bless themselves,</u>" and the meaning would not seem so universalistic. As has been said earlier, in Chapter VI, in view of the many other places where Yahweh's national limitations are obvious, no overthrow of those limitations can be postulated here, but the time is rather foreseen when Yahweh's influence will be world-wide because the influence of the nation of Israel is to extend to the ends of the earth.

The influence of the writings of J in this respect can be seen in the literature of succeeding generations. In E, who borrowed much from J, this national pride appears,

1. Bertholet, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 76 ff.

Egyptians. He urges that deception be practised to secure their departure from the country (Ex. III 18ff). He sends plagues on Egypt but spares the land of Goshen (Ex. VIII 22, IX 6, 26, XI 7). There is in all of J no given of the spirit of universalism of the later prophets, although the opposite statement is sometimes made. Gen. XII 3, XXVI 4, and XXVIII 14 are occasionally quoted as evidence of a desire on the part of J to make of his people a missionary nation, as later Second Isaiah taught with vigor. In a discussion of these verses Bertholet has pointed out[1] that the Niphal and Hiphil of the verbs therein contained should be taken in a reflexive sense. Gen. XII 3b would then be translated: "and by thee shall all the families of the earth bless themselves," and the meaning would not seem so universalistic. As has been said earlier, in Chapter VI, in view of the many other places where Yahweh's national limitations are obvious, no overthrow of those limitations can be postulated here, but the time is rather foreseen when Yahweh's influence will be world-wide because the influence of the nation of Israel is to extend to the ends of the earth.

The influence of the writings of J in this respect can be seen in the literature of succeeding generations. In E, who borrowed much from J, this national pride appears,

1. Bertholet, op. cit., p. 75 f.

although less insistently carried through. He has a great fondness for the early fathers of his people; but the thrilling promises which form a link from narrative to narrative in J, like a "red cord," as Cadbury[1] has said, are missing from his more prosaic work. Deuteronomy is the book wherein this aspect of J is mirrored most completely. In the introductory chapters I-IV and V-XI, and in the Song of Moses (Deut. XXXII) again and again reference is made to Yahweh's promises narrated in J. By the deuteronomists they are made a challenge to the people's loyalty-- Yahweh's part of the covenant which was ratified on Sinai. It is to be noted, likewise, that at this point wherein so strong a conviction on the part of the deuteronomic writers appears, no prophetic influence can be recognized, although in other directions they are largely dependent on their prophetic predecessors. The outstanding contribution of the reform prophets was the moralization of Yahweh, and coincidentally the transcending of national limitations. The idea that Israel is a peculiar people, unique in history because of the partiality of Yahweh, is drawn by the deuteronomists directly from J.

The national pride which is so prominent in J naturally distorts its value as a historical source. The splendor of the patriarchs and of the Israelitish nation in the wilderness is enhanced far beyond the bounds of

1. Cadbury, National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 60.

although less insistently carried through. He has a great fondness for the early fathers of his people; but the thrilling promises which form a link from narrative to narrative in J, like a "red cord," as Cadbury has said,[1] are missing from his more prosaic work. Deuteronomy is the book wherein this aspect of J is mirrored most completely. In the introductory chapters I-IV and V-XI, and in the Song of Moses (Deut. XXXII) again and again reference is made to Yahweh's promises narrated in J. By the deuteronomists they are made a challenge to the people's loyalty -- Yahweh's part of the covenant which was ratified on Sinai. It is to be noted, likewise, that at this point wherein so strong a conviction on the part of the deuteronomic writers appears, no prophetic influence can be recognized, although in other directions they are largely dependent on their prophetic predecessors. The outstanding contribution of the refore prophets and the moralization of Yahweh, and coincidentally the transcending of national limitations. The idea that Israel is a peculiar people, unique in history because of the partiality of Yahweh, is drawn by the deuteronomists directly from J.

The national pride which is so prominent in J naturally distorts its value as a historical source. The splendor of the patriarchs and of the Israelitish nation in the wilderness is enhanced far beyond the bounds of

1. Cadbury, National Ideals in the Old Testament, p. 60.

historical accuracy. But the purpose of a composer of a national epic is not to adhere strictly to historical truth. As Miss Louise Houghton says in Hebrew Life and Thought,[1] the epic "begins in folklore, myth or legend, or story, in which are gathered up precious memorials of events and personages of national interest. As these stories are handed down, they pass through imaginative and poetic minds..... By and by comes a true poet, a maker, and gathers up these stories of the people, this 'epic stuff;' fixing in forms of imperishable beauty these memorials which are the common property of all." Those who regret the lack of precision in regard to historical facts would do well to note the review of Roswell Page's book The Iliad of the South which appeared in the Boston Herald on July 9, 1932. No criticism appears here of this modern epic writer's knowledge and trustworthiness in presenting the story of the Civil War. It is his meticulous care in regard to details, and the resulting lack of continuous beauty and poetic charm that wearies the critic who discusses the book. In just the elements wherein The Iliad of the South is lacking the writer of J excelled. By means of his appealing, imaginative stories he caught the attention of his Israelitish readers. He stirred their minds with his faith in the possibilities of their nation, and handed on that faith to future generations of Israelites.

1. P. 94.

historical accuracy. But the purpose of a composer of a national epic is not to adhere strictly to historical truth. As Miss Louise Houghton says in Heroes Life and Thought, the epic "begins in folklore, myth or legend, or story, in which are gathered up precious memorials of events and personages of national interest. As these stories are handed down, they pass through imaginative and poetic minds..... By one by comes a true poet, a maker, and gathers up these stories of the people, this 'epic stuff!' fixing in forms of imperishable beauty these memorials which are the common property of all." Those who regret the lack of precision in regard to historical facts would do well to note the review of Howell's book The Land of the South which appeared in the Boston Herald on July 9, 1898. No criticism appears here of this modern epic writer's knowledge and trustworthiness in presenting the story of the Civil War. It is his meticulous care in regard to details, and the resulting lack of continuous beauty and poetic charm that wearies the critic who discusses the book. In just the elements wherein The Land of the South is lacking the writer of 1 excelles. By means of his sparkling, imaginative stories he caught the attention of his Teresolitian readers. He stirred their minds with his faith in the possibilities of their nation, and roused in that faith to future generations of Teresolites.

1. I. 94.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

Part I of this investigation presents the contents of J and a justification of variations therein from the usual selection of J material. Some of the most important sections which have been discarded as a result of this analysis are the following: the early material in Gen. I-XI; XV (in part); XIX 30-38; XXXIV (in part); XXXV 21,22a; XXXVIII; XLIX 1b-27; Ex. XII 21-27; XXXIV 1-28 (the analysis of this chapter agrees with Professor Pfeiffer's article on the Oldest Decalogue, in JBL, 1924, vol. XLIII.); Nu. XXII and XXIV (in part); sections in the latter part of Joshua and Ju. I and II which present the conquest as only partially successful and gradually accomplished. The material in these last sections, it has been decided, consists of editorial summaries of portions of J which have now been lost. These were made by editors who desired to preserve ancient material which had almost disappeared as a result of its presentation of a picture contrasting sharply with the usual view of the course of events. These editors made their own corrections,designed to adjust it to the orthodox theory, and inserted it at a very late date in its present location in the text.

In Part II is given an introduction to J. Chapter I discusses the date and place of composition. J was

written in Judah in the south of Palestine. Its date can not be ascertained with certainty. A choice has to be made between the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.; but possibly the balance of probability inclines to the earlier date.

In Chapter II a comparison is made of J and E.

Chapter III considers the problem of the unity of J. The work of Budde, Gunkel, Eissfeldt, and Pfeiffer is studied and an attempt is made to classify their conclusions and the supporting evidence in order to determine what are the most fruitful lines of research for the next stage of the investigation. It is decided that the most pressing problems arise in the complex narratives within J, and in the presence of narratives resembling the style, mood, and religion of the Urgeschichte in sections which are very difficult to reject from J. The principle on which Eissfeldt and Pfeiffer are agreed is accepted as a basis for further investigation: the J document is a unified work whose author was an epic writer of remarkable ability.

Chapter IV considers the sources which J employed. Tradition from the north as well as from the south was used by him; Canaanitish lore as well as Israelitic tribal tradition. Egyptian conditions interested him, but his information about this country may have been drawn from

secondary sources. Much of his material was derived from oral tradition, but he probably used also written sources. No laws can be found within J as proof to substantiate this point. The long poems in the Pentateuch are not a part of J, and the short poetical fragments need not have been derived from a written source. Nevertheless, many of the difficulties which Eissfeldt and Pfeiffer faced but which their theories did not succeed in meeting are explained by the hypothesis that the Yahwist employed written sources, and included such material within his epic with fewer alterations than he would have made in anything as fluid as oral tradition. Sections within J in which his dependence on written sources is particularly clear are the following: Gen. XVIII, XIX, XXV 21-26, XXXII 4-9,14a, the J material of Gen. XXXII 25-33, and Ex. IV 24-26. This source material was a compilation made in the south, circulating at the shrines in that mountainous region. From this J selected what he desired for his epic and rejected the rest. At least part of what he discarded was incorporated within the Pentateuch[1] just before its final publication. An undescriminating editor regretted the possible loss of any existent early material, and so he inserted at what he considered their appropriate locations

1. Cf. the early material in Gen. I-XI; XIX 30-38; XXXIV; XXXV 5, 21,22a; XXXVIII.

secondary sources. Much of his material was derived from oral tradition, but he probably used also written sources. No laws can be found within J as proof to substantiate this point. The long poems in the Pentateuch are not a part of J, and the short poetical fragments have not been derived from a written source. Nevertheless, many of the difficulties which Wellhausen and Driver faced and which their theories did not succeed in resolving are explained by the hypothesis that the Yahwist employed written sources, and included such material within his epic with some alterations. Even he would have made in anything as little as oral tradition. Sections within J in which his dependence on written sources is particularly clear are the following: Gen. XVIII, XIX, XXV 21-26, XXVII 1-5,14a, the J material of Gen. XXXII 23-33, and Ex. IV 24-26. This author whatever was a compilation made in the south, originating at the shrines in that mountainous region. From this J selected what he judged for his epic and adjusted the text. It is just part of what he discovered was incorporated within the Pentateuch just before its final redaction. As unsentimental editor rejected the possible loss of any extreme early material, and so he inserted or what he considered their appropriate locations

1. Cf. the early material in Gen. 1-11; XIX 30-38; XXIV; XXV 6, 21,22a; XXXVIII.

these sections which are often considered J.

In Chapter V the language and style of J are considered. A study of J's vocabulary is made on the basis of the newly delimited source. Many words which heretofore have been considered criteria for the assignment of verses to J are discarded as a result of this investigation. In the section devoted to a discussion of J's style an attempt is made to show how superior this author is in narrative ability to most of the other Old Testament writers. He is to be classed with Homer as one of the outstanding epic writers of the world.

Chapter VI is devoted to a study of J's religion. Yahweh, according to J, has been worshipped from time immemorial. He is the deity reverenced at the sanctuaries, who appears to his followers directly, in friendly, intimate relations. Yahweh is very powerful and very wise, but not yet omnipotent or omniscient. He performs all miracles himself without the aid of an assistant. He is distinctly a national god, who shows partiality for his own people. As a consequence, he is not an ethical deity. A national and at the same time an ethical god are irreconcilable conceptions; and the Yahwist has not yet recognized the ethical limitations of his ardent nationalism. The ritual worship offered Yahweh is deliberately omitted by J. Instead of religious rites and ceremonies

the patriarchs resort to prayer. In this J is not working under prophetic influence. He is merely a discerning precursor of the prophets.

The social institutions of J are discussed in Chapter VII. All are representative of the age in which J was written. The family is the basis of society, and the institution of marriage, the status of the women, children, slaves, and hired servants is dependent on the welfare of the group as a whole. J idealizes the early nomadic life of his ancestors, but evidence that his own experiences included conditions of a settled life in Palestine is not lacking in the document. J's ethics are not a part of his religion, but custom and national need govern his moral code. In certain respects pronounced ethical limitations are observable in this document. On the other hand, in his presentation of the idyllic life which the patriarchs lived, wherein family clashes and all warfare between neighbors were avoided, in his respect for elders, and his glorification of hospitality and generosity, he contrasts very favorably with such epics as the Iliad and Nibelungenlied.

The final chapter considers J's ardent nationalism, which is unique in antiquity until a far later day. The prosperous period in which J lived was in part responsible

for this patriotism, but his own genius evolved the thought that the nation's significance was due to Yahweh's constant guidance. By the promises and the demonstration that they were fulfilled, and by Yahweh's partiality for the nation Israel, J presented his conception to the Israelitic readers. His work bore fruits of particular value in the later efforts of the deuteronomists. Their teaching at this point departed from the ideas of the prophets, who were usually their guides, and was borrowed by this school of writers directly from J.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addis, William E. The Documents of the Hexateuch. New York, Putnam, 1892.

Alt, Albrecht. Der Gott der Väter. Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1929.

Bacon, B.W. The Triple Tradition of the Exodus. Hartford, Student Publishing Co., 1894.

Baentsch, Bruno. Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri. (Handkommentar zum alten Testament, Nowack) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1903.

Barton, G.A. A Sketch of Semitic Origins. New York, Macmillan, 1902.

Baumgärtel, Friedrich. Elohim. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914.

Baumgartner, W. Ein Kapitel vom hebräischen Erzählungsstil. (Festschrift für Hermann Gunkel, Hans Schmidt) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1923.

Bertholet, Alfred. Die Eigenart der alttestamentlichen Religion. Tübingen, Mohr, 1913.

A History of Hebrew Civilization. Translated by A. K. Douglas. London, Harrap, 1926.

Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden. Freiburg, Mohr, 1896.

Bewer, J.A. The Literature of the Old Testament in Its Historical Development. New York, Columbia University Press, 1922.

Bissell, E.C. The Pentateuch. New York, 1885.

Briggs, C.A. The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch. New York, Scribners, 1893.

Brightman, E.S. The Sources of the Hexateuch. New York, Abingdon Press, 1918.

Budde, Karl. Die biblische Urgeschichte. Giessen, Ricker, 1883.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[illegible], William L. The Technology of the Computer. New York, Wiley, 1[illegible].

[illegible], Edward. Der Weg der Welt. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1[illegible].

[illegible], T.R. The Social Position of the Engineer. Portland, National Publishing Co., 1[illegible].

[illegible], Frank. Science-Mobility-Power. (Proceedings of the Atlantic Conference, Zweck, Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1[illegible].

[illegible], J.A. [illegible] of Technical Education. [illegible], [illegible], 1[illegible].

[illegible], Ernst. Industry. London: Longmans, 1914.

[illegible], H. The Problem and Organization of Research. (Proceedings of the Science Teaching Conference, 1[illegible]) [illegible], Vandenhoeck, 1[illegible].

[illegible], Alfred. The Growth of Scientific Civilization. [illegible], [illegible], 1[illegible].

A History of Science. Lawrence. Encyclopedia of [illegible]. Lucien. [illegible], 1[illegible].

The Institution and Organization of Science in Modern Society. [illegible], 1[illegible].

[illegible], T.A. The Influence of Science on Technical Development. [illegible], [illegible], 1[illegible].

[illegible], S.C. The Engineers. New York, 1[illegible].

[illegible], J.A. Engineering Education in the Technical University. [illegible], Berlin, [illegible].

[illegible], J.A. The Science of the Engineer. New York, [illegible], 1[illegible].

[illegible], Karl. The Scientific Revolution. Tübingen, Mohr, 1[illegible].

Das Buch der Richter. (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum alten Testament, Marti) Freiburg, Mohr, 1897.

Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur. Leipzig, Amelang, 1906.

Cadbury, Henry J. National Ideals in the Old Testament. New York, Scribners, 1920.

The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. III. New York, Macmillan, 1925.

Carpenter, J.E.,and Battersby, G.H. The Hexateuch. London, Longmans, 1900.

Carpenter, J.E., and Harford, George. The Composition of the Hexateuch. New York, Longmans, 1902.

Chapman, A.T. An Introduction to the Pentateuch. (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge, University Press, 1911.

Clay, Albert T. Light on the Old Testament from Babel. Philadelphia, Sunday School Times, 1907.

Cook, Stanley A. The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology. London, Oxford University Press, 1930.

Cornill, Carl. Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament. Translated by G.H. Box. New York, Putnam, 1907.

Dahse, Johannes. Textkritische Materialen zur Hexateuchfrage. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1912.

Wie erklärt sich der gegenwärtige Zustand der Genesis? Giessen, Töpelmann, 1913.

Doumergue, E. Moïse et la Genèse. Paris, Editions de Foi et Vie, 1920.

Driver, S.R. Deuteronomy. (International Critical Commentary) New York, Scribners, 1916.

An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. New York, Scribners, 1914.

Duff, Archibald. History of Old Testament Criticism. New York, Putnam, 1910.

Eerdmans, B.D. Alttestamentliche Studien. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1908.

Eiselen, F.C. The Books of the Pentateuch. New York, Methodist Book Concern, 1916.

Eissfeldt, Otto. Hexateuch-Synopse. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922.

Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1931.

Erman, Adolf. Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Altertum. Tübingen, Laupp, 1885.

Erman, A., and Ranke, Hermann. Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben im Altertum. Tübingen, Mohr, 1923.

Gautier, Lucien. Introduction à l'Ancien Testament. Lausanne, Bridel, 1914.

Geden, A.S. Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1909.

Gray, G.B. A Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. New York, Scribners, 1921.

Numbers. (International Critical Commentary) New York, Scribners, 1903.

Gressmann, Hugo. Die Anfänge Israels. (Die Schriften des alten Testaments. Vol. I 2) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1922.

Mose und seine Zeit. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1913.

Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzählungen. (ZAW. Vol. XXX, 1910)

Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Sage. (Festschrift für Hermann Gunkel, Hans Schmidt) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1923.

Gunkel, Hermann. Genesis. (Handkommentar zum alten Testament, Nowack) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1901.

Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen. (Die Schriften des alten Testaments. Vol. I 1) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1921.

Guthe, Hermann. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Tübingen, Mohr, 1914.

Haller, Max. Religion, Recht und Sitte in den Genesissagen. Bern, Gustav Grunau, 1905.

Harford, John Battersby. Since Wellhausen. London, Hunter and Longhurst, 1926.

Heinisch, Paul. Das Buch Genesis. Bonn, Haustein, 1930.

Der Wechsel der Namen Jakob und Israel in der Genesis. (Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge. Vol. VI, 1929)

Hölscher, Gustav. Die Profeten. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914.

Holzinger, H. Einleitung in den Hexateuch. Leipzig, Mohr, 1893.

Genesis, 1898. Exodus, 1900. Numeri, 1903. Das Buch Josua, 1901. In Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum alten Testament. Tübingen, Mohr.

Houghton, Louise S. Hebrew Life and Thought. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1907.

Kautzsch, E. An Outline of the History of the Literature of the Old Testament. Translated by John Taylor. New York, Putnam, 1899.

Kennett, R.H. Old Testament Essays. Cambridge, University Press, 1928.

Kittel, R. A History of the Hebrews. Translated by John Taylor. Vol. I. London, Williams and Norgate, 1895.

Geschichte des Volkes Israel.[3] Vol. I. Gotha, Perthes, 1916.

Klaehn, Theodor. Die sprachliche Verwandtschaft der Quelle K der Samuelisbücher mit der Quelle J des Heptateuch. Leipzig, Noske, 1914.

Klostermann, August. Der Pentateuch. Leipzig, Deichert, 1893.

König, Eduard. Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung. Leipzig, Deichert, 1914.

Kraeling, E.G.H. Aram and Israel. New York, Columbia University Press, 1918.

Kuenen, Abraham. The Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch. Translated by P.H. Wicksteed. London, Macmillan, 1886.

Kyle, M.G. The Problem of the Pentateuch. Oberlin, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1920.

Lods, Adolphe. Jean Astruc et la Critique biblique au XVIIIe Siècle. Paris, Libraire Istra, 1924.

Luther, B. Die israelitischen Stämme. (ZAW. Vol. XXI,1901)

Die Persönlichkeit des Jahwisten. (Meyer, Die Israeliten) Halle, Niemeyer, 1906.

McFadyen, John Edgar. Introduction to the Old Testament.[3] New York, Armstrong, 1906.

Meyer, Eduard. Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme. Mit Beitragen von Bernhard Luther. Halle, Niemeyer, 1906.

Kritik der Berichte über die Eroberung Palaestinas. (ZAW. Vol. I, 1881)

Moore, G.F. Articles Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, in Encycl. Bibl. London, Black, 1901.

Judges. (International Critical Commentary) New York, Scribners, 1895.

The Literature of the Old Testament. New York, Holt, 1913.

Naville, Edouard. The Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch. Translated by J.R. MacKay. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1923.

Nikel, Johannes. Die Pentateuchfrage. (Biblische Zeitfragen. Vol. X, 1921)

Noyes, Carleton. The Genius of Israel. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Orr, James. The Problem of the Old Testament. New York, Scribners, 1906.

Peet, T. Eric. Egypt and the Old Testament. Boston, Small, Maynard, 1923.

Pfeiffer, R.H. Edomitic Wisdom. (ZAW. N.F. III, 1926)

A Non-Israelitic Source of the Book of Genesis. (ZAW. N.F. VII, 1930)

Notes on the Festschrift für Hermann Gunkel. (Harvard Theological Review. Vol. XVII. No. 3, 1924)

The Oldest Decalogue. (JBL. Vol. XLIII, 1924)

Procksch, Otto. Die Genesis. (Kommentar zum alten Testament, Sellin) Leipzig, Scholl, 1924.

Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch. Die Elohimquelle. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1906.

Renan, Ernest. Histoire du Peuple d'Israël. Vol. II. Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1889.

Romanoff, Paul. A Third Version of the Flood Narrative. (JBL. Vol. L, 1931)

Schaeffer, Henry. The Social Legislation of the Primitive Semites. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1915.

Sellin, Ernst. Die biblische Urgeschichte. Berlin, Edwin Runge, 1905.

Introduction to the Old Testament. Translated by W. Montgomery. London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Simpson, D.C. Pentateuchal Criticism. London, Oxford University Press, Milford, 1924.

Skinner, John. Genesis. (International Critical Commentary) New York, Scribners, 1910.

Smend, Rudolf. Die Erzählung des Hexateuch. Berlin, Reimer, 1912.

Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte. Freiburg, Mohr, 1893.

Soares, Theodore G. The Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible. New York, Abingdon Press, 1915.

Spiegelberg, Wilhelm. Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen. 50, 2 ff.) im Lichte der ägypt. Quellen. (OLZ. Vol. XXVI, 1923)

Steuernagel, Carl. Deuteronomium und Josua. (Handkommentar zum alten Testament, Nowack) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1900.

Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stämme in Kanaan. Berlin, Schwetschke, 1901.

Strack, H.L. Einleitung in das alte Testament.[4] München, Beck, 1895.

Trabaud, H. L'Introduction à l'Ancien Testament. Saint-Blaise, Foyer Solidariste, 1911.

Wallis, Louis. Sociological Study of the Bible. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1912.

Wellhausen, J. Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments. Berlin, Reimer, 1889.

Prolegomena to the History of Israel. Translated by J.S. Black and Allan Menzies. Edinburgh, Black, 1885.

Westphal, Alexandre. Les Sources du Pentateuque. (Vol. I, Le Problème Litteraire, 1888. Vol. II, Le Problème Historique, 1892) Paris, Librairie Fischbacher.

Wiener, Harold M. Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism. Oberlin, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1909.

Pentateuchal Studies. Oberlin, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1912.

Zimmermann, Hellmuth. Elohim. Berlin, Mayer and Müller, 1900.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Beatrice Laura Goff was born in Andover, Massachusetts on December 14, 1903, the daughter of Frederick B. and Laura Farnum Goff.

Her early education was obtained in the public schools of that town, and she attended the Punchard High School for two years. She completed her secondary school education in Abbot Academy, which is situated in Andover, and graduated from the latter school in June, 1922.

In the fall of 1922 she entered Wellesley College, and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from that institution in 1926.

In 1926-1927 she served as assistant in the Department of Biblical History of that college.

In June 1928 she received the degree of Master of Arts from Wellesley College, offering as partial fulfilment of the requirements for that degree work carried on in Radcliffe College.

The year 1928-1929 was spent in private study under the direction of professors in Harvard University.

During the years 1930-1933 she pursued studies in Boston University toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

In the second semester of the year 1931-1932 she substituted, during the leave of absence of one of the regular professors, as instructor in the Department of

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Beatrice Lewis Scott was born in Andover, Massachusetts on December 14, 1905, the daughter of Frederick P. and Laura Parsons Scott.

Her early education was obtained in the public schools of that town, and she attended the Phillips High School for two years. She completed her secondary school education in Abbot Academy, which is situated in Andover, and graduated from the latter school in June, 1922.

In the fall of 1922 she entered Wellesley College, and received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from that institution in 1926.

In 1926-1927 she served as assistant in the Department of Political History of that college.

In this year she received the degree of Master of Arts from Wellesley College, writing as partial fulfillment of the requirements the thesis degree work carried on in Radcliffe College.

The year 1928-1929 was spent in private study under the direction of professors in Harvard Univ ersity.

During the years 1929-1932 she pursued studies in Boston University toward the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

In the second semester of the year 1931-1932 she substituted, during the leave of absence of one of the regular professors, as instructor in the Department of

Religion of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Virginia.